A DISCOURSE CONCERNING The Idolatry OF THE CHURCH of ROME:

WHEREIN

That *CHARGE* is *Juſtified*;

AND

The Pretended Refutation of Dr. *STILLINGFLEET's* Diſcourſe is *Anſwered*.

By *DANIEL WHITBY*, D. D.

Mirum videtur quare in uno articulo qui non eſt principalis artriculus fidei debeat talis intellectus aſſeri, propter quem fides pateat contemptui omnium ſequentium rationem. Scotus in 4 ſent. diſt. 11. q. 3. lit. B.

LONDON,

Printed for *Tho. Baſſet*, at the *George* near St. *Dunſtans* Church in *Fleetſtreet*, and *Ja. Magnes* near the *Piazza* in *Covent Garden*, 1674.

UMI

TO THE

Moſt Reverend Father in God

GILBERT

LORD ARCHBISHOP

OF

CANTERBURY.

May it pleaſe your Grace.

IT is the Cuſtom of the Adverſaries of our Church to thruſt out their Errors into the World, under ſome great name; that by the Protection of ſome honorable Perſon, to whom they Dedicate their Books, they may render them

more plauſible in the Eye of the World, and add greater weight and Authority to their groſs Falſhoods.

My Lord, We live in ſuch an age, in which Truth ſtands in greater need of a Patron than Falſhood it ſelf: and though this little poor Treatiſe be not worthy to bear your great name in the front, yet the Truth I here defend, will I doubt not, be owned and ſupported by your *Grace*; whoſe great deſign in this World is to ſupport the *Church* of *England*. 'Tis the ſame Faith, and the ſame Doctrin I here deliver which your Glorious Predeceſſors in both your Sees of *Canterbury*, and *London*; *Cranmer* and *Ridley* owned and aſſerted even unto Blood. 'Tis a defence of that great learned man, who has made it his buſineſs, now for

for ſome years, to defend the Writings of the renowned *Archbiſhop Laud*; for whoſe memory and writings you have often expreſſed ſo great Veneration. Theſe conſiderations are enough alone to prove the fitneſs of this addreſs. But beſides theſe, your *Grace* may juſtly challenge the labours of all your own *Univerſity*: You have obliged them to that degree, that the Gifts of half their Benefactors, amaſſed into one ſumme, would ſcarce equal your famous *Theatre*. And as they fail not to give God thanks for ſo great a Patron, at the times of publick ſolemnity, ſo am I under the ſame Obligation, for that ſupport you beſtowed on me for ſome years together, whileſt I was a member of *Trinity Colledge*, and before I had the happineſs and honor to be rela-

ted to my *Lord* of *Sarum*. Whoſoever knows this, will certainly excuſe my boldneſs: and if to make this addreſs be impudence; yet not to have done it, would have been ingratitude.

God preſerve your Grace for the Churches ſake.

I am Your Graces

humbly devoted

Servant.

D. W.

To

TO THE READER.

Courteous Reader.

Think my ſelf obliged to give thee an account, 1. *Why I undertake to anſwer this Diſcourſe. And* 2. *Why having undertaken to return an Anſwer to it, I have omitted part, the firſt; of which, the true account is briefly this, ſince the Printers would not undertake the Printing of the whole, before the Term expired, I was contented to defer that part, which I conceived to be leaſt material, to the Term enſuing. That which firſt moved me to frame this Anſwer to* T. G. *was this, having peruſed this Author, and having found him laying the moſt ſcandalous accuſations and imputations of* Sophiſtry *and* Legerdemain, *Falſhood and Contradiction to the Doctors charge, I knew not how to think that any perſon, who profeſſed Chriſtianity, or valued either his credit or his cauſe, ſhould lay ſuch imputations upon others, and be himſelf the perſon Guilty: Nor yet could I be eaſily perſwaded, that any perſon in ſo good a cauſe as ours, in which Authorities and Arguments do preſs for an admittance, and Men of ordinary Capacities, muſt be abundantly ſupplied with them; much leſs that the incomparable* Dr. Stillingfleet, *that prodigy of Ingenuity and Learning, ſhould betake himſelf to ſuch diſhonourable Arts. Beſides I*

knew that his Integrity and ſenſe of honor was ſo great, that he muſt ſcorn ſuch ſordid dealing; and that it was his buſineſs to detect the Frauds and religious Cheates of Rome; and therefore I preſumed he would not imitate her, when he did confute her. Wherefore my curioſity engaged me to examine all that was deviſed to blaſt his Credit, and having found it to be written in the old Roman Style, and to contain nothing, but the pure quinteſſence of Calumny, I thought it charity to eaſe the Doctor, and to declare unto the World what was the fruit of this inquiry.

And ſhould this work be ſo unhappy, which I hope it will not, as to rob the World of the Ingenious and Triumphant Labors of the Learned Dr. yet I have two things to apologize.

1. That the Dr. hath given us the greateſt evidence, that he can write moſt admirable Books upon the meaneſt Subjects, and in anſwer to the moſt trifling and inconſiderable Scriblers; ſo that whatever Adverſarie he vouchſafes to anſwer, he almoſt equally obligeth and inſtructeth all that read him, but moſt of all his adverſary, whoſe Name he reſcues from obſcurity, whilſt he vouchſafes to mention it.

2. That which I have performed will give us this advantage to the common cauſe, viz. That through the ſtrength and goodneſs of it, a little inconſiderable David may worſt the beſt Goliah of the Roman Church.

In proſecution of this ſubject, I have ſet down the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, not from the ſayings of her private Doctors, but from her Councils, Catechiſms, and Authentick Liturgies, that ſo I might obſtruct all poſſibility of pleading, that I do falſly repreſent her Tenets. But though I uſe

this

this method, I do not think it either ſophiſtical or uſeleſs, to repreſent unto the World what are the Doctrines and Practices, which have ſo far obtained in the Church of Rome, *as to be Doctrines and Practiſes of no ſmall Credit & Authority amongſt them they being held and defended by their moſt able Writers, and taught and practiſed with as much freedome in the Church of* Rome, *as are the contrary Doctrines. And to omit thoſe many inſtances which do not ſo immediately concern the preſent Controverſy.*

It is a very common and prevayling Doctrine, among the Doctors *of the* Church *of* Rome, *that the bleſſed* Virgin, *is the Mother of Mercy, not only by vertue of her* interceſſion, *but* by way of diſtribution, and of Diſpenſation, *and that Chriſt having reſerved the* Kingdom of Juſtice to himſelf, hath granted the Kingdom of mercy to his Mother; *and that he hath given to her what* Aſſuerus *promiſed to Queen* Heſter, *viz. The half of his Dominions, or his Kingly Office: This Doctrine is delivered by* Thomas Bonaventure, Gerſon, Gabriel Biel, Antoninus, Bernardinus, Gorrhan, Holcoth, Rutilius Benzonius, Blaſius Viegas, Oſorius, Paulus Cararia, *and many others whoſe words are cited by Dr.* * White, * Crakanthorp, *and Biſhop* Uſher *in his Anſwer to the* Jeſuits *challenge, from* page 478 to page 496. *Where alſo you may find them teaching, that* the Dominion of the bleſſed Virgin is equal to the Dominion of her Son, that all power in Heaven and Earth, was given to her, that ſhe is conſtituted over every Creature, and whoſoever boweth his knee unto Jeſus, doth fall down alſo and ſupplicate unto his Mother: ſo that the glory of the Son may be judged not ſo much to be

* From p. 356. to p. 363. * p. 321. 323. 398, 399. p. 478. 481. p. 480. p. 486.

Ibid. be common with the Mother, as to be the very ſame. That the mighty God did (as far as he might) make his Mother partner of his Divine Majeſty and power; giving unto her of old the Soveraignty both of Cœleſtial things
p. 478. and Mortal. *That* in the redundance of effuſion of Grace upon the Creatures, the Lords power and will is ſo accommodated unto her that ſhe may ſeem to be the firſt in that, both Dia-
p. 481. dem, and Tribunal. *And that* all things are ſubject to the command of the *Virgin*, even
p. 482. God himſelf. *They alſo teach*, *that* by ſinning after Baptiſme, men ſeem to have contemned and deſpiſed the Paſſion of Chriſt: That ſo no Sinner doth deſerve that Chriſt ſhould any more make Interceſſion for him to the Father; without whoſe Interceſſion none can be delivered either from Eternal Puniſhment or the temporal, nor from the fault which he hath voluntarily committed. *And therefore that* it was neceſſary that Chriſt ſhould conſtitute his well-beloved Mother a Mediatrix betwixt us and him. And ſo in this our Pilgrimage, there is no other refuge left unto us in our tribulations and adverſities, but to have recourſe unto the *Virgin Mary* our Mediatrix that ſhe would ap-
Ibid. peaſe the wrath of her Son. *That* as he is aſcended into Heaven, to appear in the ſight of God for men (*Heb.* 9. 24.) So ſhe ought to aſcend thither, to appear in the ſight of her Son for ſinners: that ſo mankind might have alwayes before the face of God a help like unto Chriſt for the procuring of his Salvation. *And that*
p. 484. ſhe is that throne of Grace, *whereof the Apoſtle ſpeaketh*, Heb. 4. 16. Let us go boldly unto the Throne of Grace that we may receive mercy, and find grace to help in the time of need.

That

That ſhe comes before the Throne of Grace not entreating but commanding. p. 486.

In the Pſalter of our Lady *we have theſe Addreſſes.* Bleſſed are they whoſe hearts do love thee, O Virgin *Mary*; their ſinns by thee ſhall be mercifully waſhed away. Pſ. 31. Have mercy upon me O Lady, who art called the Mother of Mercy; and according to the bowels of thy Mercies, cleanſe me from all mine Iniquities. Pſ. 50. Save me Lady, by thy name; and deliver me from mine unrighteouſneſs. Pſ. 53. Give the King thy judgement, O God, and thy mercy to the Queen his Mother. Pſ. 71. Oh come let us ſing unto our Lady; Let us make a joyful noiſe to *Mary* our Queen that brings Salvation. Pſ. 94. Oh our Omnipotent Lady, thou art my Salvation, thou haſt freed me condemned to death; thou art the beginning and the finiſher of my Salvation. Cant ad Virg. M. poſt Pſal. *There you may find them teaching that* by her, Sinns are purged; by her, true ſatisfaction is made for ſinns, the Death and Paſſion of Chriſt, and of the bleſſed Virgin, *ſaith Petrus Galatinus*, conduced to the redemption of Mankind. *The Stellarium Coronæ beatæ* Mariæ, *ſaith*, ſhe bought us; and as Chriſt Redeemed Mankind by his Fleſh and Blood, ſo ſhe redeemed the ſame with her Soul. Pſ. 118. Pſ. 41. Pſ. 136. De Arcan. Cathol. verit. l. 7. c. 10. White, p. 357.

Theſe Doctrines and many other of the ſame Blaſphemous ſtamp, are taught and held by many Doctors *of the* Roman Church: *theſe books and doctrines are written and licenſed by that* Church, *and ſo have* Catholick permiſſion; *no cenſure ever paſſed upon them, no* Expurgatory Index *hath cleanſed them from theſe horrid Blaſphemies; but it is ſtill left free for any of the Doctors of that Communion to maintain and propagate them; and for any of the members of that* Church *to practiſe ſutably to theſe conceptions. To aſcribe all this*

this power and Authority to the Bleſſed Virgin, *and all this vertue to her Death, to give her the praiſes of it, and accordingly to truſt in her, to pray unto her for the bleſſings ſhe hath purchaſed, and for the diſtribution of thoſe Favors, which naturally do reſult from this advancement; and when they addreſs themſelves unto her, to uſe the moſt extravagant expreſſions contained in the* Ladys Pſalter, *and in other books of the like nature with it. Whence it will follow,*

1, *That any perſon, who acts according to theſe Doctrines, and puts up theſe Petitions, doth not deviate from that Tradition, which the Catholick conceives to be his only rule of Faith* (id eſt) *a perſon may be guilty of horrid* Blaſphemy *and* Idolatry, *and notwithſtanding be a good* Roman Catholick.

2. *It follows that no man ought to be condemned for writing or aſſerting any of theſe Tenets, or for uſing any of the formes contained in thoſe books, for Oral Tradition cannot be conceived to condemn what is allowed and practiſed, without cenſure in the Church of* Rome.

3. *Hence evident it is, that* private Catholicks *may unavoidably be ſubject to theſe evil practiſes; for ſeeing in theſe matters they cannot have the judgement of the Church, and muſt not be permitted to act according to their private judgements, what remains but that they follow the judgement of their* Prieſt, *which as we have ſeen, is often impious and Blaſphemous.*

4. *Hence evident it is, that neither theſe opinions, nor practiſes can ever be condemned by the* Church *of* Rome; *for to make the contrary Tenets paſs into Tradition, or to make them Articles of Faith, is to empower the Church to coyn new Articles, and to pretend Tradition where it is not*

to

to be had: So that all these Blasphemous and Idolatrous Devotions must be as lasting as the Church *of* Rome.

Secondly, *I have observed this method in my whole discourse.* 1. *To confirm the propositions which I have laid down by Scripture, and by reason, and then to introduce the Judgement of the* Fathers. *Whereas* T. G. *is very sparing both as to Scripture and Reason, and doth endeavor to supply his want of Reason and of Scripture, by some impertinent citations from the* Fathers. *This I conceive to be a very weak and disingenious way of arguing; for, if the Testimonies of some few* Fathers *be not sufficient to confirm an Article of Faith, and to give us the true sense of any text of Scripture, he must confess, that what he thus discourseth is weak and insufficient to prove what he hath undertaken to demonstrate: but if he shall assert this method to be good and cogent, then it will clearly follow,*

1. *That the Doctrine of the* Trent Council *must be false, for they have certainly decreed, that Doctrine which was asserted by* Pope Innocent the first, S. Austin, *and which was the current Doctrine of the* Church of Christ *for many hundred years.* I wave the Opinion of Austin *and of* Innocent the first, *saith Maldonate* which flourished in the Church six hundred years, *viz.* that the Eucharist was necessary even for Infants, the thing is now unfolded by the Church, and by the use of many ages, and the decree of the *Trent Council* that it is not only unnecessary for them, but that it cannot lawfully be given to them. In Joh. 6. n. 116.

2. *It must be false which is defined by the Council of* Florence, *and is received by the whole Church of* Rome, *that* Saints departed before the Resurrection do see the face of God in Glory, *for we have*

have proved, *and* Sixtus Senenſis *doth acknow-*
Bibl. l. 6. An. 345. *ledge, that this definition was*, *Repugnant* Ingenti numero illuſtrium Eccleſiæ Patrum.

3. *Hence it will follow that the* Trent Catechiſm *and all the* Roman Doctors *who generally urge that of* Jacob, The Angel that redeemed me from all evil bleſs the Lads, *to prove that Angels may be Invocated, embrace that expoſition of theſe words of Scripture which is heretically falſe; as I have proved*, Chap. 10. Sect. 6.

Thirdly, *I have not entred into that deep diſpute betwixt him and the* Doctor, *whether* jubere *doth ſignify to command or entreat; and whether* imperare *be to enjoyn or ſupplicate. I Judge it is ſufficient advantage to our cauſe, that, if* jubere *and* imperare *ſhould not be rendred to entreat and ſupplicate, but to command, the Romaniſts muſt unavoidably be guilty of Idolatry.* T. G. *indeed informs us, that it is not the dead words, but the intention of the ſpeaker that makes them to be prayer; for otherwiſe a* Parrot *might be taught to Pray as well as a Chriſtian, and thence he manfully concludes that in theſe expreſſions,* Nos a peccatis omnibus ſolvite juſſu quæſumus. Jube filio O fœlix puerpera, jure Matris Impera Redemptori, *&c.*
Caſſand. Conſult. tit. de meritis & interceſſ. Sanctor. p. 971. *They only pray to Saints to pray for us. As if a man ſhould call his Prince a Tyrant, and his Brother Knave, and being brought before the Judge ſhould plead, that by a Tyrant he meant only a King, and by a Knave a Servant; and ſince it was not the dead words, but the intention of the ſpeaker that made them ſignificative (for otherwiſe a* Parrot *might be hanged for ſpeaking what he did) he hoped that he had ſpoken nothing which might give offence, eſpecially ſeeing he had more Authors ready to produce to juſtify this ſenſe and acceptation of theſe words, than had the* Church *of* Rome *for this inter-*

pre-

pretation of jubere *and* imperare; *if when the Sentence were thus paſſed upon him,* Jubemus & imperamus hunc ſuſpendi, *he ſhould plead that it did only ſignify that they entreated him to be hanged: I ſay ſhould ſuch a plea be made, it would be as ſignificant as is this Anſwer of* T.G. *And all that any man can ſay againſt the Plea of ſuch a trifling Sophiſter will equally conclude againſt this pittiful defence which he hath offered, and hath confirmed by a falſe citation of that place of* Joſhuah *which doth not ſay that God* obeyed, *as from the Vulgar he tranſlates it: but that God* hearkened to *the Voice of man.* Joſh. 10. 12, 14.

Fourthly, *In this diſcourſe I have not waved any thing which had the leaſt appearance of an argument, but have returned a full (and as I hope, a ſatisfactory) Anſwer to all that hath been offered by* T.G. *and all that I deſire of him is, that if he ſhould be pleaſed to Reply he would not nibble at ſome few Expreſſions, as is the manner of the Roman party, but would return a perfect Anſwer to the whole, and then I do not doubt, but, he will Suffer me to reſt for ſome convenient Seaſon.*

Thy Friend and Servant

D. WHITBY.

Errata.

PAg. 4. l. 5. for Surerſtition r. ſuperſtition. p. 11. l. 12. honerem r. honorem. p. 33. l. 18. mby r. may. p. 40. l. 27. from r. for. p. 45. l. 5. [illegible] r. [illegible] p. 55. l. 16. overthrows r. overthrow. p. 56. marg. configere r. confingere. p. 60. l. 23. ef r. of. ibid, marg. creatura r. creaturam. p. 78. [illegible] r. [illegible] p. 86. l. 23. ſguiritual r. ſpiritual. p. 90. Marcarius r. Macarius. p. 91. Symbol a r. a Symbol. p. 93. po r. do. p. 340. Chap. 11. r. Chap. 12.

THE IDOLATRY Of the Church of ROME.

CHAP. I.

The CONTENTS.

1. *That according to the Doctrine of the Church of* England, *the Church of* Rome *is Guilty of Idolatry.* 1. *In Worshipping the Host*, §. 1. *And* 2. *In Praying to departed Saints*, §. 2. *The Method used to Justifie this Charge*, §. 3. *The Notion of Idolatry considered Negatively in two Propositions.* 1. *That to render any Person Guilty of Idolatry, it is not Requisite that he should Conceive the Object of his Worship to be the Great Creator, or the chiefest Good*, §. 4. 2. *That Worship may be Guilty of Idolatry which is not Given to a Creature, with an Intent to Ascribe unto it that Worship which Agrees to God alone*, §. 5. *Idolatry is then Committed when any Honour due to God alone, is Attributed to, or is Conferd on that which is not God*, §. 6.

THE Doctrine of the Church of *England* as it is Delivered in her Injunctions, Canons, Orders, Ordinances and Conſtitutions, her *Liturgies*, and Publick *Homilies commanded to be Read in every Pariſh Church*, and to be *Subſcribed* and *Received by all that Exerciſe the Miniſterial Function*, and by them to be acknowledged to contain a *Good* and *Wholeſome Doctrine*, and *Needful* for the *Times* in which thoſe Homilies were Publiſhed, is this:

That the Church of *Rome* is Guilty of Idolatry in Worſhipping the *Hoſt*: The *Rubrick* after the Communion, ſpeaks thus: *The Sacramental Bread and Wine remain ſtill in their very natural Subſtances and therefore may not be Adored, for that were Idolatry to be Abhorred of all faithful Chriſtians.* The Conſtitutions and Canons of the Convocation held *A. D.* 1640. and Publiſhed by the Authority of our Royal Martyr *Charles* the Firſt, affirm: *That at the time of Reforming this Church from that groſs Superſtition of* Popery, *it was carefully Provided that all Means ſhould be uſed to Root out of the Minds of the People, both the Inclination thereunto, and Memory thereof: Eſpecially of the Idolatry committed in the Maſs, for which cauſe all Popiſh Altars were Demoliſhed.*

Can. 7.

That the Church of *Rome* is Guilty of Idolatry by Praying unto Saints Departed: Thus in the Homily touching the Peril of *Idolatry*, we have theſe words. *Terrentius Varro ſheweth, That there were* 300 Jupiters *in his time, I think we had no fewer Saints to whom we gave the Honour due to God*: Then follows this Apoſtrophe. "Oh Heaven, "Earth, and Seas, what Madneſs and Wicked-

§. 2.

"neſs

"neſs againſt God are men fallen into! What diſ-
"honour do the Creatures to their Creator and
"Maker! And if we remember God ſometimes,
"yet becauſe we doubt of his Ability, or Will to
"help us, we joyn to him another Helper, uſing
"theſe ſayings: Such as Learn, *God and St. Ni-*
"*cholas be my good ſpeed:* Such as Neeſe, *God*
"*help and St. John*: To the Horſe, *God and St.*
"*Loy ſave thee.* Thus are we become like Horſes
"and Mules, which have no Underſtanding. For
"is there not one God only, who Governeth the
"ſame? and by his goodneſs maintaineth and
"ſerveth them? be not all things of him, by
"him, and through him? Why doſt thou turn
"from the Creator to the Creatures? This is
"the manner of the Gentil-Idolaters: but thou
"art a Chriſtian, and therefore *by Chriſt alone*
"haſt acceſs to God the Father, and help of him
"*only.* Theſe things are not written to any re-
"proach of the Saints themſelves, but againſt our
"fooliſhneſs and wickedneſs, making of the true
"Servants of God falſe Gods, by attributing to
"them the Power and Honour which is Gods,
"and due to him only. And for that we have
"ſuch opinions of the power and ready help of
"Saints, all our *Legends*, *Hymns*, *Sequenſes*, and
"*Maſſes* did contain ſtories, Lauds and praiſes of
"them, and prayers to them; and this we do al-
"together agreeable to the Saints, as did the
"Gentile-Idolaters to their falſe Gods. If
"anſwer be made, that they make Saints but In-
"terceſſors to God, and means for ſuch things as
"they would obtain of God: That is even after
"the Gentile-Idolatrous uſage, to make them of
"Saints Gods, called, *Dij medioximi*, to be mean
"Interceſſors and helpers to God. This is the

Doctrine appointed to be read and taught in every Pariſh Church of *England*. In the Injunctions of *Edward* the Sixt, publiſhed 1547. All Paſtors are enjoyned to teach *for the reproof of Superſtition and Pilgrimage made to Saints, that all goodneſs, health, and grace, ought to be both asked and looked for only of God, as of the very Author and Giver of the ſame, and of none other.* And in the Injunction of Queen *Elizabeth* 1559. We have the ſame reiterated, viz. *To the intent that all Superſtition and Hypocriſie crept into divers mens hearts, may vaniſh away, they ſhall teach, that all goodneſs, health, and grace, ought to be both asked and looked for only of God, as of the very Author and giver of the ſame, and of none other.*

§. 3. And now to evidence the Truth and Juſtice of this imputation; we ſhall firſt ſhew what is the nature of Idolatry; and what actions may be duely charged with it. Next we ſhall faithfully relate the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *Rome* from her own *Catechiſm*, *Church-ſervice*, and *Authentick Councils*. Thirdly, we ſhall conſider what *T. G.* and others of that Church have offer'd to excuſe her practice from this imputation; And then ſhall leave it to the judgment of all impartial and diſcerning Readers, whether we have not ſuch convincing clear and pregnant reaſons to pronounce her guilty of this moſt hainous ſin, that the moſt ſubtil wit cannot evade, nor the moſt obſtinate deny.

And firſt to ſhew wherein the nature of *Idolatry* conſiſts, and to confute and baffle all the tricks and *Salvo's* which the adverſe party hath of late invented to excuſe their practice in this matter from this hainous guilt, we aſſert, as followeth.

That

That to render any perſon guilty of Idolatry, it is not neceſſary that he ſhould conceive the Creature which he worſhips to be the great Creator, and the chiefeſt good, the end and the beginning of all things, or to conceive that which he worſhips is no Creature. Prop. 1.

For firſt, if this were requiſite to render any perſon guilty of this crime, then no man could commit Idolatry, who knows, and doth acknowledge the true *Jehovah* to be the *only* God; Though he ſhould Sacrifice to *Devils*, and to ſtocks and ſtones; Though he ſhould worſhip the Sun, Moon, and Stars, and all the hoſt of Heaven, with all the Rites and Ceremonies that have been uſed by the Heathen world: nay ſhould he have as many petty and inferior Gods as *Ægypt*, *Rome*, or the whole Heathen world did ever own; and ſhould perform that homage, which according to the cuſtom of thoſe Nations where they were received was due unto them; yet would he not be guilty of the leaſt Idolatry, becauſe he could not poſſibly conceive them to be the great Creator, or the higheſt God, and yet conceive the true God to be only ſo.

2. Hence it would clearly follow; that thoſe Chriſtians who refuſed to Sacrifice or offer Incenſe unto the Images and Statues of the Heathen *Emperors*, and to thoſe *Dæmons* which they worſhiped as inferior beings, and ſubject to that being, whom the Heathens ſtile ὁ θεὸς τῶν ὅλων, ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεός, or the Supream and higheſt God were miſerably out, and wretchedly deceived in their apprehenſions, for it is evident by all their writings, and by the accuſations of their Adverſaries, that they refuſed to pay this homage to them, becauſe they thought it was Idolatry: whereas according to this Rule it was not poſſible that they who owned the true *Jehovah* in contradi-

ction to all others, could commit that sin, or justly be suspected of it. 3. The Christians constantly pronounced the Heathens guilty of Idolatry in worshiping their lesser Deities. And when the *Arians* and *Nestorians* sprung up, they with one voice pronounced them guilty of the like hainous crime; because, by giving that homage which the *Orthodox* conceived due to God, to him whom they affirmed to be only man; they did * τὰ τῶν ἑλλήνων ἐπεισάγειν, (i.e.) *they introduced that Idolatry the Heathens practised*; the *Angelitæ*, as * *Photius*, or the *Angelicks*, as St. *Austine* stiles them who prayed to Angels, and by them thought to have access unto the Father, The Church of God did antiently condemn τῆς κεκρυμένης εἰδωλολατρίας, as being *guilty of occult Idolatry*. The *Collyridians* who offerd Cakes unto the blessed Virgin, were said to do a *devilish work, and introduce a custom which made them guilty of Idolatry*; and yet it is exceeding manifest, that neither any of those Heathens did conceive those *petty Gods* as they are pleased to stile them, the supream being, or the great Creator of the world; nor could the like conceptions of *Christ*, the blessed *Virgin*, or the *Angels* be any ways consistent to that Christianity which the *Arians*, *Angelicks* and *Collyridians* did constantly profess. As for the Heathens their *Dæmons* were accounted [a] ὑπερέται τῶν θεῶν, *the Ministers of God*, δεύτεροι θεοὶ, *Secundary Gods*, διακονικαὶ φύσεις, *Ministring Spirits*, μεσῖται, seu [b] potestatis Mediæ, *a middle sort of Intercessors*, [c] inferioris notæ & de plebe Dii, *inferior vulgar Gods*. Secondly, they held them to be [d] Dii facti & a summo Deo conditi (i. e.) *such as received their beings from the supream God*, who therefore by the Latines was so often stiled *Divum Pater*, and by the Greeks,

πατὴς

* Basil Hom. 27. Ed. Paris. p. 510.

* Nomo Can. Tit. 12. c. 8. Cod. Can. Ecc. Univ. Cant. 139. Το εγκερημα διαβολικὸν καὶ το ἐπιτήδευμα εἰδωλόποιον. Epiph. Hær. 79. p. 1061. B.

a] Plutarc. de Def. Or. p 416, 417.

b] Apuleus de demon. Socratis. p. 45.

c] Sen Ep 110. p 840

d] Austin de C. D. l. 9. c. 3.

πατὴρ ἀνδρῶντε θεῶντε, and the like. And Thirdly, they say the Heathens had their [e] Commission from God, and only were his *undergovernours*, and by him placed over *Towns* and *Countreys*. Fourthly, they held the worship due unto them, to be a middle and inferior kind of worship, τούτοις οὖν ὡς δευτέροις τὴν δευτέραν τιμὴν ἀποδιδόναι χρῆ, saith *Hierocles*: that is, God must be worshiped with *Latria*: but those inferior Dæmons with *Dulia*; and that to worship them [f] according to that Dignity they had received from their God and Father, was the true worship due unto them: and hence they gave this caution in paying homage to them, μὴ ὑπεραίρειν τὴν ἀξίαν, *Hierocles*, page the 10. not to give more than was consistent with their Dignity. The (g) *Angelicks* did not doubt but that those *Angels*, whom they used as *Intercessors*, were the Creatures and Ministers of God, nor could they hope to reap advantage by their Intercession; had they intended by so doing, to confer upon them the worship proper to that jealous God, who *will not give his glory to an other*.

e] ἡμέτεροι φάσιν νενέμεσθαι τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐθναρκοῖς καὶ πολιούχοις θεοῖς. Julian. apud Cyril. Alex. l. 4. p. 115.

f] τὸ γὰρ ἦν ἐτάκθησαν ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ πατρὸς ταύτῃ αὐτοὺς τιμᾶν τῷ θείῳ νόμῳ κατακολυθεῖν ἔστι, καὶ τὴν ὄντως τιμὴν αὐτοῖς ἀποδιδόναι. Hieroc. p. 10.

g] This was their Doctrine προσήκει διὰ τῶν Ἀγγέλων τὴν θεῖαν εὐμένειαν πραγματεύεσθαι, Theodoret in c. 2. ad Coloss.

The *Arians* had the same apprehensions of Christ Jesus, they stile him *Dei instrumentum*, ὑπρέτην, ὄργανον, διάκονον ὑπουργὸν; *his Ministers*, *his Creature*: from whence it follows, that they could intend to offer up no other worship to him, but what was proper to a Creature: And hence the Fathers tell us, that they performed to the

Sacred Trinity, honorificentiæ imparis officium [h] *unequal honours*, and could not be induced to worship Christ, ἐπ' ἴσῃ τῷ γεγεννηκότι πατρί, *with worship equal to the Father.* [k] And that if any man conceived these words of the Evangelist St. *John*, *that all should worship the Son, as they worshiped the Father*; to contain a precept or injunction, to give unto the Son a worship equal unto that we give the Father, *he was exceedingly mistaken.*

[h] Fulg. l. 2. ad Monim. c. 2.

[i] Ἡμῶν δὲ τὸν δι' ἁπάντων σωθέντα σεσεβῶσθαι τὸν οὕτως τιμᾶν ὀφείλομεν καθὼς τιμᾶται ὁ πατὴρ, τοῖς λεγομένοις ἐπιπόλαιον γίνεται, μὴ καὶ τὸ διὰ τῶν τοιούτων θεοσεβὲς τῷ ἀγχιστικότι πταῖσαι. Gregor. Nyssen. l. 4. Contr. Eunom. p. 588. 13.

[k] Εἰ δὲ τὸ λεγόμενον φησὶν ἵνα πάντες τιμῶσι τὸν υἱὸν καθὼς τιμῶσι τὸν πατέρα, ἵνα μὴ ζητῶμεν ἕτερόν τινα τὸν υἱὸν ἰσομετρεῖσθαι τῷ πατρὶ καταστήσωμεν τὴν τιμὴν ἀγνοοῦντες τῆς ἀληθείας μακρὰν τοῦ ζητουμένου. Cyrill. Alex. l. 2. in Joh. c. 8. To. 4. p. 226. E.

4. The *Apoſtle* tells the Church of *Corinth*, that he who in the Temple of an Idol did eat and drink of what was Sacrificed to the Idol, did *drink the Cup of Devils*, and was made partaker of the *Devils Table*, and had *Communion* with them. 1 *Cor.* 10. 20, 21. and ſo was guilty of Idolatry: to introduce and to confirm this charge, he layes down this aſſertion, *verſ.* 7. that they who did ſit down to eat and drink of what was offerd to the golden *Calfs*, were by ſo doing guilty of Idolatry, and upon this account he thus exhorts thoſe perſons who endulged themſelves in this unlawful practice, *be ye not Idolaters as were ſome of them.*

Whence it is clear, that St. *Paul* judged this practice well deſerved that imputation, and yet it is as certain that they who uſed it, were induced to do ſo upon this preſumption, that they conceived *the Idol to be nothing*, and therefore not the great Creator, and the chiefeſt good.

1 Cor. viii. 4. x. 19.

Hence

Hence therefore we infer the vanity and falsness of those descriptions of Idolatry, which are delivered by the Doctors of the *Roman Church*, who being conscious to themselves and having openly confessed, that to the (*l*) Images of Christ and of the Cross, and of the blessed Trinity, they give that worship which they stile *Latria*, and which is properly Divine, excuse themselves from this enormous guilt, by saying that they do not give this worship to them as to God, and make the formal reason of Idolatry consist in giving Divine worship to the Creature, upon this apprehension, that it is a God. *Idolatry*, saith (*n*) Gregory of Valence *is a Superstition, whereby we tender Divine honour to the Creature, as to God: Latria*, or that Adoration which agrees to God alone, *is the most profound prostration and inclination of the will attended with an apprehension of God as the first principle, last end, and chiefest good.* So Bellarmine (*o*) *Those words of Christ, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God*, &c. *must thus be understood: Thou shalt not worship false Gods, as the Heathens do, but that true God who is but one, to whom alone thou shalt exhibite Divine worship, as to the true God*: So (*p*) *Becanus*, whence he infers, they are not to be counted guilty of Idolatry by Invocation and Adoration of Saints departed, *quia non adorant eos tanquam Deos*: (*q*) The like mistake to say no worse, we find in Mr. *Thorndike* when he asserts, that *this is requisite to make the Romanists Idolaters*, viz. *to take the Elements for God.*

That worship may be guilty of Idolatry, which is not given to a Creature with an intention to make that Creature be esteemed for a God, or with an intention to ascribe unto that Creature the excellency which agrees to God alone; This proposition may be

l] Constans est Theologorum sententia imaginem eodem honore & cultu honorari & coli quo colitur id cujus est Imago Azor. Instit Moral. To. 1 l. 9. c. 6.

n] L. 2. de Idol. c. 1.

o] L. 2. de Eccâ Triumph. c. 12. p. 1503 B.

p] Manual l. 1. c. 7. qu. 1.

q] Just weights, chap. 19.

Prop. 2. §. 5.

+ Mr. Thorndike dyed 1672. sss Woods part. 1st p. 391.

be confirmed by what we have discoursed upon, the first, it being certain that the *Eunomians*, *Arians*, *Nestorians*, did not intend by any worship they performed to Christ, to work in any this estimation that he was a God, but that above all things they did endeavour to perswade the contrary, and they who sate at meat in Idols Temples, and by partaking of things Sacrificed to them were guilty of Spiritual whoredom or Idolatry. Believed themselves, and taught to others this assertion; *that an Idol was nothing in the world.* And it is apparent also that according to this principle the holy Martyrs might have worshiped with all kinds of honour, not only *Emperors* and *Kings*, but even the *Prince* of *Devils*, without the imputation of Idolatry; Provided they did not inwardly intend by any act of worship to procure unto them the estimation of a Deity. 4. They who resort unto the *Hag* and the (r) *Magician*, the *Sorcerer* and *Wizard*, do not believe, much less endeavour to work this estimation in the hearts of others, that they are truly God. And yet the Church of *Rome* condemns them, who (thinking they can do what they pretend to) consult these wicked *Artists*, as persons guilty of Idolatry. 5. By the like reason, no married man commits Adultery by lying with another woman, provided he intends not to converse with any other under the notion of a Wife: a fine expedient in this debauched age, to make new converts to the Church of *Rome*. And in like manner no Subject will be guilty of *Rebellion* though he desert his Prince, follow the Ensigns of his Enemy, and fight in his defence against his *Soveraign*, provided he intend not by so doing to procure to his Enemy the estimation of a *King*.

r] Peccant in primum preceptum qui somniis, auguriis caeterisq; vanissimis rebus fidem habent. Catech. Rom part 3. c 1. ss. 7.

These

§. 6.

These falſe opinions being thus removed, we aſſert, *That Idolatry is then committed, when any honour due to God alone is attributed to, or is conferd upon any thing that is not God: and that all actions which give unto the Creature the honour due to the Creator only, are Idolatrous*: And this deſcripeion of Idolatry, is that which was received by the antient Schoolmen, till the diſputes of Proteſtants conſtrained them to renounce and vary from it. Thus in the judgment of (*s*) *Aquinas* it is Idolatry, cuicunq; Creaturæ divinum cultum exhibere, honerem divinum Creaturæ impendere divinum cultum exhibere, cui non debet exhiberi; *To impart divine worſhip to any Creature, or any thing to which it ought not to be given. All divine worſhip given to a Creature is Idolatry*: So (*t*) *Alexander Halenſis*, to omit divers others. This alſo is the definition, or deſcription of Idolatry we have received from the antient Fathers of the Church. [*u*] *Tertullian* and *Nazianzen*, St. *Auguſtine*, and almoſt all the *Greek* and *Latine Fathers* with one voice conſent to this. Idolatry is then committed when divine honour is aſcribed to another; hence that of *Hilary* the *Deacon, Idolatry uſurps the honour due to God, and gives it to the Creature*: This Thirdly may be evidently proved from Scripture, for that the *Gentiles* were guilty of this hainous crime, cannot be doubted by the *Chriſtian*: now their Idolatry did in the judgment of St. *Paul* conſiſt in this, *that they did homage to thoſe beings which by nature were not Gods*; but Creatures only. Secondly, the firſt commandment in the affirmative, commands us to have the true *Jehovah* for our God, and conſequently to give unto him that worſhip which is due to God; when therefore in the Negative it doth enjoyn us *to have no other God beſides*

ſ] 2a 2æ. qu. 94. Art. 1. 3.

t] Part. 2. qu. 160.

u] Vid. voſs de Idol. l. 1. c. 3: p. 9. Rainold de R. Ecc. Idol. l. 2. c. 9. §. 4. *Idololatria Dei honorificentiam uſurpat & vendicat creaturæ in cap. 5. ad Epheſ. *Gal. 4. 8.

besides him, it must be deemed to enjoyn us also to give unto no other that worship which we owe unto him; and by which we acknowledge him to be our God: and even reason will instruct us, that he who doth ascribe Gods worship, he gives his glory to another; and acknowledgeth another God, as much as any man can do. For we know no other way whereby we can acknowledge any thing to be a Deity, but by ascribing to it in our thoughts or actions that worship which is due to God alone.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The CONTENTS.

Prop. 1. *That if the Sacrament continue after Conſecration to be Bread, the Church of* Rome *is guilty of Idolatry.*

Prop. 2. *That if it really be doubtful whether it be Bread or not, ſhe cannot be excuſed from that Crime.*

Prop. 3. *That we have juſt cauſe to doubt of every particular Hoſt, according to the Doctrine of the Church of* Rome, *that it is not duely conſecrated, and conſequently, that the Sacrament is after Conſecration, Bread and Wine.*

Prop. 4. *That were it certain that every particular Hoſt contains Chriſts real Fleſh and Blood, yet have we no juſt warrant upon that Suppoſition, to adore it with* Latria.

§. 1.

THe Church of *Rome* expreſly doth enjoyn us to give the Worſhip of *Latria* * *huic Sanctiſſimo Sacramento, to the Holy Sacrament*, as the *Trent Council* hath defined, that is, unto that very being vvhich the Prieſt puts into the mouth of the Communicant, and vvhich he muſt ſvvallovv dovvn into his Stomack, for that they call the Holy Sacrament. Hence preſently they tell us,

* Nullus itaq; dubitandi locus relinquitur quin omnes Chriſti fideles Latriæ cultum qui vero Deo debetur huic Sanctiſſimo Sacramento in veneratione exhibeant: neq; enim ideo minus eſt adorandum quod fuerit a Chriſto Domino, ut ſumatur, inſtitutum. Concil. Trid. Seſs. 13. c. 5.

That

That this Holy Sacrament ought not to be the leſs adored, becauſe our Lord commanded that it ſhould be taken: This practice we conceive to be *Idolatry*, and to make good the charge we lay down theſe preparatory Propoſitions.

Prop. 1. *We may be guilty of Idolatry in paying divine Homage to a Creature, though we conceive that Creature to be God, and ſo intend to give that worſhip only to God*; for if ſuch a vain conception which we may have juſt reaſon to reject, but can have no inevitable and certain reaſon to embrace can be ſufficient to excuſe this guilt: then he who thus conceits touching the vileſt Creature, cannot juſtly be charged with Idolatry, what ever act of worſhip he ſhould pay unto it; admit we then the Heathen *Jupiter*, the World, the Sun, the Earth and whatſoever elſe was worſhiped by the ignorant and ſuperſtitious world, as their ſupream Creator, to be the vileſt *Devils*: pitty we may their ignorance and folly, but no man ſhould accuſe them of Idolatry, for paying Adoration to a Subject which in their apprehenſions
p. 363. did ſo well deſerve it; and what *T. G.* ſo often mentions as an Aggravation of that worſhip which *Pagans* gave to their inferior *Dæmons*, viz. *that they eſteemed them to be Gods*, would be their beſt excuſe, and the extenuation of their guilt. And thoſe expreſſions of the Prophets which reproach the *Jews* and *Heathens* for *ſaying to a ſtock*
Jer. 2. 27. *or ſtone thou art my God*, if they be literally under-
Hoſ. 4. 12. ſtood, *as many Roman Doctors do* conceive they ought to be, will be ſo far from proving that they were Idolaters, that they will perfectly excuſe them from this crime; becauſe, according to that ſuppoſition, they worſhiped only that which they conceived to be God. The *Collyridians*, if we be well informed by *Baronius*, conceived

ved the blessed *Virgin vvas a real Deity*, and yet St. *Epiphanius* calls them *a Sect of Idol-makers* who offered their Cakes unto her. The (*b*) *Samaritans* who worshiped *Simon Magus*; The *Romans*, who, if *Justin Martyr* may be credited, in honour of him did erect a *Satue* with this inscription *Simoni Deo Sancto, to Simon the Holy God*, and many others, who, as (*c*) *Irenæus* tells us, *did glorifie him as God*, and had his Image made like to that of *Jupiter*, which they adored; all these I say must be excused from Idolatry, for they all did it upon this presumption *that he vvas the highest God, God over all Principalities and Povvers, and all other virtues*. Thirdly, If this were so, this error in the understanding would equally take off the guilt of other Sins. This would excuse the theft of him who robbs his wicked Brother of his goods; provided that he think with our *Phanatick*, *that all Dominion is founded upon Grace, and that a vvicked person hath no right to any thing he possesseth*; for, as he that worshipeth the Host upon this false presumption *that it is no Creature, but the great Creator*, conceives he worshipeth only God, and doth not give his worship unto another: So this *Phanatick* conceives he taketh only what is his by right of grace, and what his wicked Brother hath no right unto, and so cannot be guilty of that theft, which necessarily is *the taking of what is anothers, and is not mine own*; Again the *Rebel* who unsheathed his Sword against his *King* will not be guilty of Rebellion, provided he erroniously conceived as did the *Presbyterian*; *That the Kings Majesty was not the highest power, but that the power of the Parliament was equal with him*, and Co-ordinate, or if

Hær. 79. p. 1061. B.

p. 91,

b καὶ Χεδὸν πάντες μὲν Σαμαρεῖς ὡς τὸν πρῶτον θεὸν ἐκεῖνον ὁμολογοῦντες ἐκεῖνον καὶ προσκυνοῦσι. Just. Mart. Apol. 2. p. 69.

c Hic igitur a multis quasi Deus Glorificatus est, Iren. adv. Hæres. l. 1. c. 20. Imaginem quoq; Simonis habent factam ad figuram Jovis, & Helenæ in figuram Minervæ & has adorant. ibid.

ἀθεὸν ὑπερᾶ ὠπάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως εἶναι λέγουσιν. Just. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 349. c.

he

he think, as did the *Iriſh* Rebels, *that being excommunicated by the Pope, he becomes preſently a Tyrant*, and hath no further right to his *Dominions*: For if the Adorer of the Hoſt (provided that it be a Creature) muſt be excuſed from Idolatry, becauſe he therefore only worſhips it; becauſe he falſly thinks it to be God, why may not both theſe ſorts of *Rebels* be abſolved from ſuch an hainous imputation? Since though the *King* is really the higheſt power, and notwithſtanding the interdiction of the *Pope*, continues ſo to be; yet they do only fight againſt him under the notion of a *Tyrant*, or of a power *Co-ordinate*. Fourthly, St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of ſome who worſhiped the Sun, as thinking it was Jeſus Chriſt, or that Chriſt was in the Sun, and yet he ſticks not to condemn this worſhip as a contempt of the Creator. To this example (urged by Dr. *St.* to evince, that if the Hoſt after the Conſecration did continue Bread, the *Romaniſt* muſt be guilty of Idolatry in paying of *Latria* to it, as were the *Manichees* in giving of that worſhip to the Sun) *T. G.* returns this anſwer, *that the diſparity is ſo*
P. 327. *clear, that not to ſee it was in the* Dr. *a very groſs miſtake, and he appeals unto the Reader for the truth of what he ſaith*, viz. *That they worſhiped the Sun, whom they falſly thought to be Chriſt* (even as the Papiſts worſhip the Sacrament which they falſly think to be Chriſt) i. e. *what they had in their minds and purpoſes to adore was the Sun, but the Catholicks do not believe the bread to be Chriſt, or worſhip the Bread which they believe to be Chriſt; no their miſtake, if there was any, would be that they believed the Bread not to be there at all, and therefore what they would have in their minds and purpoſes to adore would not, nor could not be bread, but the only true and eternal Son of God.* Anſwer, even

even ſo the *Manichees* did not conceive the Sun to be a Creature only, nor did they worſhip that Sun which they conceived to be a meer Creature; nay, their miſtake, if there were any would be this, that they believed no Creature to be there at all, or elſe that Chriſt reſided in the Creature; *what therefore they had in their minds and purpoſes to adore would not, nor could not be a Creature, but the true and eternal Son of God*: but Secondly, this ſenſeleſs pittiful excuſe will free the *Heathens* from this imputation, for they did not believe their *Jupiter* to be an evil Spirit, or a *Creature*, but the God of all things: they did not worſhip him whom they believed to be an evil Spirit; no, when they appeared before his *Image*, and there addreſſed their worſhip to him, they believed no evil Spirit to be there at all; and therefore what they had in their minds and purpoſes to adore, would not, nor could not be an evil Spirit, but the true and only God. *T. G.* proceeds to ſay the difference then in the miſtakes is this; *That the* Manichees *had for the formal Term of their worſhip an undue object*, viz. *A Creature inſtead of the Creator; but Catholicks in caſe of a miſtake would have no other formal object of Adoration in their minds, but the Creator himſelf.* Anſwer, 1 What means this ignorant and ſimple Tattle *of the formal term of worſhip*, but to amuze the Reader, and make him hope that he ſaith ſomething, when he hath nothing but a meſs of non-ſence to return unto the Doctors argument? *Divinity* and *Metaphyſicks* are wholly ſtrangers to this rude expreſſion; in *Logick* a material term is the word. *Homo*, The formal term is what the word doth ſignifie, ſo then the ſenſe runs thus, *the* Manichees *had for the ſignification of this word, worſhip, an undue object, admirable non-ſenſe.*

* Manichæi dicebant ſe colere Deum Patrem & filium ejus Chriſtum, ſed quia per deum intelligebant lucem corpoream, per Chriſtum ſolem iſtum Corporeum nihil habebant Dei & Chriſti niſi ſolum nomen. *Bellarm.*

(2) What is the formal object, but the reason for which the outward or the material object is Adored? This being so, is it not clearer than the Sun, that they who had this apprehension in their minds, that what we call the Sun was also Jesus Christ, and for that only reason did Adore it, had equally no other formal object, as they who had this apprehension that the Host was Christ, and therefore did Adore it: and if the Host continue Bread, must not the Adoration terminated on it, be terminated on a Creature, must not the formal term of the *Latria* or worship which is given to it, be an undue object.

If this erroneous conception will excuse the Authors of it from being guilty of Idolatry, then first the *Israelites* could not be rightly stiled Idolaters for worshiping the golden Calf, for many of the *Roman* Doctors assert, they did it upon this presumption, that the Calf was God, and yet the holy Scripture doth expresly say *they were Idolaters*, by doing thus, and that *they offered Sacrifice unto the Idol*, which sure is little better than Idolatry. To this instance of the golden Calf, he answers thus, *The* Israelites *believed the golden Calf to be God, but Catholicks (though supposed to be mistaken in their belief) would not worship the Bread for Christ, because their mistake would not be in taking the Bread for God, as the* Israelites *did the Calf: but in this that they conceived the Bread not to be there at all, but in place thereof the only true and eternal God; and so although* the object (*or rather Subject*) materially *there present* would in such a case be Bread; *yet their act of Adoration would not be terminated formally upon that, but upon God.* Answer, as if this also were not their mistake who held the Calf to be God, that they conceived no Creature to be there at all,

1 Cor. 10. 7.

7 Act. 41.

P. 329.

all, but in place thereof the only true and eternal God; (for can it be poſſible that the *Iſraelites* ſhould conceive the Calf to be God, and not conceive that when they worſhipped him as God, they had no Creature to be the object of their worſhip) and ſo although the object materially preſent would in ſuch a caſe be the golden Calf, yet the act of Adoration would not be terminated formally on that, but upon God?

5*ly*. *T. G.* proceeds to tell us in the words of Dr. *Taylor*, that *if they thought Chriſt were not preſent, they are ſo far from worſhiping the Bread in this caſe, that themſelves profeſs it to be Idolatry ſo to do, which is a demonſtration that their Soul hath nothing in it which is Idololatrical.* P. 329. Anſwer, even ſo had not the *Heathens* thought that a good Spirit was preſent in their Images, had not the *Manichees* and the *Egyptians* thought that God and Chriſt were preſent where we ſee the Sun: had not the *Iſraelites* thought that God was preſent where they ſaw the Image of a Calf, they would have been ſo far from worſhiping the Calf or the material Sun, that they themſelves would have profeſſed it to be Idololatrical to do ſo; which is a demonſtration that their Soul hath nothing in it which is Idololatrical. And whereas he proceeds to add from Dr. *Taylor*, *that before they paſs an Act of Adoration, they believe the Bread to be annihilated, or turned into his ſubſtance who may lawfully be worſhipped, and they who have theſe thoughts are as much enemies of Idolatry, as they who underſtand better:* P. 336. it is manifeſt this doth as much excuſe the *Heathen*, as it doth the *Papiſt*, for they alſo before they paſs an Act of Adoration, do believe that what they worſhip, is the God of Heaven, who lawfully may be worſhipped; and having ſuch conceptions, they according to this

argument must be esteemed as much enemies of Idolatry, as were those Christians, and those *Prophets* which reproved them for it, and passed so wicked and unjust a censure on them. *Baronius* tells us that the *Collyridians* conceived that the blessed Virgin was a real Deity, and that she had nothing humane in her, and so before they ventured to Adore her, they believed her humane nature was annihilated, or turned into his substance who may lawfully be worshipped; and yet, if we may credit *Epiphanius*, it was no better than an Idol-making *Heresie*, and they were *Diabolical Idolaters*: So that those passages of that ingenious and learned *Prelate*, serve only to demonstrate that the highest judgment, and the most pregnant subtile wit must strangely shuffle, and most assuredly miscarry, when it endeavours to excuse the Church of *Rome* from being guilty of Idolatry: when the same Reverend Person undertook to shew the vanity and folly of what he had delivered on that Subject to excuse the Papist, when he proceeds *to shew the grounds by which his judgment was established*, no man could more apparently assert, or more convincingly demonstrate what the *Roman Catholicks* alledged to free them from this Sin, would free the worst of Heathens. For he intreats them to consider, first, that no man without his *own fault, can mistake a Creature so far as to suppose him to be God*; (especially not such a Creature as a piece of Bread.)

Apparat. 43.

Real presence. P. 347.

1 b. p. 340. 341, 342.

Secondly, *That when the Heathens worshipped the Sun and Moon, they did it upon their confidence that they were Gods, and would not have given to them Divine Honour, if they had thought otherwise.* Thirdly, *That no man in the world upon these grounds, except he that is malicious and spightful, can*

can be an Idolater: for if he have an ignorance great enough to excuſe him, he can be no Idolater; if he have not, he is ſpightful, and malicious, and then all the Heathens are alſo excuſed as well as they. Fourthly, *That if good intent and ignorance in ſuch caſes can take off the crime, then the perſecutors that killed the Apoſtles, thinking they did God good ſervice, and* Saul *in blaſpheming the Religion, and perſecuting the Servants of Jeſus, and the Jewes themſelves in Crucifying the Lord of Life, who did it ignorantly, as did alſo their Rulers, have met with their excuſe upon the ſame account.*

T. G. proceeds to urge from Mr. *Thorndike* p. 332. thus, (and truly he hath nothing worth conſideration in his whole diſcourſe, but what is borrowed either from Dr. *Taylor* or Mr. *Thorndike*) *they who know that the God-head of Chriſt is the reaſon, for which his Fleſh and Blood is worſhipped in the Euchariſt, cannot take that worſhip for Idolatry, becauſe his Fleſh and Blood is not preſent in the Euchariſt, as they who worſhip it there, think it is; For they know, that the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt is no Idol to Chriſtians whereſoever it is worſhipped.* Anſwer, This argument is ſo ridiculous and childiſh, that I am tempted to believe this worthy perſon was deſerted in this matter by God, becauſe he had deſerted the Doctrine of the Church of *England*; for ſo far are we from knowing that the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt is made no Idol by the Chriſtian whereſoever it is worſhipped, that we do know that the whole Church of Chriſt condemned the *Arian*, *Photinian*, *Neſtorian*, and *Eunomian* as Idol-worſhippers, becauſe they did Adore his Fleſh and Blood, this argument therefore is built on that foundation which gives the lie to the whole Chriſtian World.

Secondly, This argument doth as much excuſe the *Heathens* and the *Manicheans* as it doth the *Papiſt*, for they that know the Deity of Chriſt, is the reaſon why he was worſhipped in the Sun, have as much reaſon to excuſe the *Manichees* for worſhipping the Sun, upon this ſuppoſition that Chriſt was there, as they have to excuſe the Papiſt for worſhipping the Sacrament, upon a like falſe ſuppoſition that Chriſt is there,

P. 329. But now comes in a *Demonſtration*, ſo full of *dazling* light, that nothing can withſtand its evidence, and thus it runs; *what ever is taken for an object of worſhip, the underſtanding muſt affirm to be.*

But Catholicks in the belief of Tranſubſtantiation do not in their minds affirm the Bread to be. Therefore the object of their worſhip is not Bread but Chriſt: Anſwer, what *T. G.* ignorantly ſtiles a Demonſtration, is ſuch a miſerable Sophiſm, ſo childiſh and ridiculous that nothing can be more: what Freſhman knows not, that a true Syllogiſm hath but three terms, and cannot poſſibly admit of more, it being built on this foundation, that *quæ conveniunt in aliquo tertio*, &c. But he hath been ſo liberal as to afford us five or ſix, and give us a concluſion from the premiſes, which never was contained in them. Let us put it into better form, and ſee if it have any ſtrength or evidence; thus then, *what ever is taken by the Roman Catholick for any object of his worſhip, muſt be affirmed by the Roman Catholick to be. But Bread in holy Euchariſt is not affirmed by the Roman Catholick to be.* Ergo, *Bread in the holy Euchariſt is not taken by the Roman Catholick for any object of his worſhip.* This Demonſtration is ſo exceedingly convincing, that we grant the whole. For though we do unanimouſly judge that Papiſts in the

the Eucharist do worship Bread, and so are guilty of Idolatry; yet no man ever thought that they imagined they did worship Bread, or take Bread for the object of that worship which they call *Latria*; to shew the vanity and folly of this pretended Demonstration, let us see what service it will do unto the Heathens: *what ever is taken for an object of Divine worship the understanding must affirm to be so, for neither the Ægyptians had made the Sun the object of that worship, nor yet the* Israelites *the Calf if their understanding had not first affirmed them to be so. But Heathens do not in their minds affirm an evil Spirit, or a Creature to be an object of Divine worship, but do conceive the object of their worship to be God: therefore the object of the Heathens worship is not an evil Spirit or a Creature but God.* This is that weighty Demonstration which our Author boasts of. Having now fully answered all the exceptions of *T. G.* I will assume the confidence to say, that notwithstanding all his out-cryes of a clear disparity, and his malitious imputations of want of Reason, and Conscience, in the Dr. who asserts the contrary, I have made it clearer than the light, that he hath not been able to say one word which is not manifestly false, or doth not equally excuse the † Heathen and the Roman Catholick; and consequently that the discourse of Dr. *St.* was strong and nervous, and such as only Rats can answer, and shall content my self with this one corollary, that *T. G.* may be highly confident and

† This is confessed by *Catherinus* in these words, Audi in hostia con

adoratur Christus ad Deus, non simplicitur, sed ut existens sub his speciebus; cum igitur ibi non existat Christus, sed Creatura pro Christo invenitur, cui exhibetur *Latria*; Idolatria est, Idololatræ enim etiam hâc errant ratione, qui cælum, puta, aut aliquid aliud adorabant, putantes se ibi adorare Deum, quem animam mundi dicebant juxta Varronis Theologiam. Cathar. adverf. nova dogmata Cajetani Tit de veneratione storump, 134. 135.

boast of Demonstration, when he vents nothing besides plain non-sense, and apparent folly.

And now to put an issue to this proposition, if men may properly be said to do, and equitably may be charged with doing what they did not intend, because their action in effect is that which they conceived it not to be, as is apparent from a Thousand Scripture instances, then may the *Papist* be equitably charged with Idolatry, and properly affirmed to commit it; *provided the material object of his* Latria *should be only Bread*, although he doth not in the least intend to give the highest worship to Bread, for since Idolatry is only *Latria* given to, or terminated on the Creature, and seeing Bread is most assuredly a Creature, *Latria* terminated upon Bread can be no other than Idolatry. but if men must be thought to do *only what they intend*, then every action must be good, provided it be well intended; and Murther, Theft, Rebellions, Perjuries, Equivocations must be sacred actions, provided they be done for the promotion of Gods glory, and the propagation of the *Roman* faith; which Doctrines though they are taught, and daily practised by the members of the *Roman Church*, yet are they villanies too dangerous to be espoused by the *English Papists*.

Prop. 2. §. 2. *To attribute by way of honour, worship, or respect, that knowledge to a Creature, which for any thing we know unto the contrary, is only due to the Creator, is to be guilty of Idolatry.* For first, *That which is not of Faith is Sin.* Rom. 14. 23. what therefore is a sin, because it attributeth to the Creature what may be due to the Creator only, must be the sin of giving to the Creature what is due to God; and so, being an Act of Worship, must be the sin of Idol Worship; for as the

the man who doth aſſert what he conceives to be uncertain for a certain truth, is by all *Caſuiſts* eſteemed a Lyar, though what he doth aſſert ſhould prove a truth, becauſe he doth aſſert that for a certain Truth, which he conceives may be a Lye: And as that Woman who performs the duties of a Wife to any perſon of whom ſhe doubts that he is not her Husband, is to be eſteemed an Adultereſs, although he be indeed her Husband with whom ſhe thus converſeth, becauſe by doing of this Action, whilſt the doubt remaineth, ſhe doth that Action, which for any thing ſhe knows unto the contrary, may be plain Adultery. So he that performeth that honour to a Creature, which he ſuſpecteth only to be due to God, muſt be pronounced guilty of Idolatry, however he perform that Worſhip only which is due unto the Creature, becauſe by doing of it whilſt any cauſe of doubt remaineth, he ſhews an inclination to perform it to the Creature, though it belonged not to him; and in effect doth ſay. *I have juſt reaſon to ſuſpect this Worſhip doth belong to God alone, yet will I give it to a Creature.*

Prop. 3. §. 3.

Suppoſe the Bread, when duely conſecrated, were certainly converted into the Body of our Lord, yet ſince, according to the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, *this conſecration often is, and may be hindred by many ſecret defects which do not fall under the Cogniſance of him that Worſhips; a man may rationally doubt of every particular Hoſt preſented to his adoration, that it is only Bread.* This [a] *Garnet* openly confeſſed, and therefore though they ſtand obliged to believe that the Bread is Tranſubſtantiated ſome where or other, at ſome

[a] *Garnettus* quidem, cum tale quid ab eo quæreretur, reſpondiſſe dicitur, Merito dubitari de eo poſſe, nec vel ſe, vel alium quenquam teneri, temerè credere, aut ſalutem ſuam credendo in diſcrimen

diſcrimen adducere; quod vel ipſe ſcilicet, vel alius quis in individuo ſacerdos; vel hoc, vel certo alio conſecrationis ſuæ tempore, panem Tranſtubſtantiando Chriſti corpus conficiat. Statui forſitan poſſe in genere, atq; indefinitè, quod Tranſubſtantiatio ſit, & quod ab aliquo, alicubi Sacerdote tale quid, aliquando fieri poſſit. *Epiſcopus Elienſis, Reſpon* ad *Apol. Bel.* pag. 7.

time or other, by ſome Prieſt or other, yet they think no man is obliged to believe, that any Prieſt now, or at any one certain time, does conſecrate effectively. And this conceſſion is not very liberal, if we conſider what is acknowledged by *Suarez*, [b] *That we may almoſt infinitely proceed in the enumeration of the defects, which will obſtruct Chriſts preſence in the Holy Sacrament.* For as we are informed by the *Roman Miſſal, if the* [c] *Prieſt happen to diminiſh, or alter any of the words of Conſecration, ſo that the ſenſe be varied, or any word belonging to the form of Conſecration be omitted*; in all theſe caſes Chriſt is not preſent in the Sacrament, but it remaineth Bread; now ſince the form of Conſecration of the Cup containeth 22 words, and ſo is the more ſubject to diminution or alteration, ſeeing the Prieſt doth always ſpeak the words of Conſecration in a [d] ſecret voice, and not to be heard, and in the

[b] Multæ ſunt cauſæ propter quas poteſt accidere, ut Chriſtus non ſit præſens: ut ſi ſacerdos non ſit baptizatus, vel non ſit ritè ordinatus, quod penderet ex multis aliis cauſis, quibus ferè in infinitum progredi poſſumus; ut ex parte materiæ ſæpe accidit defectus. *Suarez* in 3 *Thom. qu.* 79. *Art.* 8. *Diſp.* 65. 2.

c Si aliquid deſit ex iis quæ ad integritatem verborum in ipſâ conſecratione requiruntur. Verba autem conſecrationis, quæ ſunt forma hujus Sacramenti, ſunt hæc, hoc eſt enim corpus meum, & hic eſt enim calix ſanguinis mei novi & æterni Teſtamenti, miſterium fidei, qui pro vobis, & pro multis effundetur in remiſſionem peccatorum: Si quis autem aliquid diminueret vel immutaret de forma conſecrationis corporis & ſanguinis, & in ipſa verborum immutatione, verba idem non ſignificarent: non Conficeret Sacramentum. *Miſs. Rom.* de *Defec. Miſs.* p. 35.

d Si quis dixerit Eccleſiæ R. ritum quo ſubmiſſa voce pars canonis & verba conſecrationis proferuntur damnandum eſſe, aut lingua tantum vulgari miſſam celebrari debere anathema ſit *Concil. Trid. Seſs.* 22. *Can.* 9.

Latine

Latine Tongue, none of the People can be certain that he ſpeaks the words of Conſecration ſo fully and ſo regularly as to ſecure them from Worſhipping a piece of Bread.

Secondly, [e] *If the Bread be corrupted, or if it be not Wheaten-Bread, then is it not converted into Chriſts Body; and if the Wine be ſowre, or turned into Vinegar, if it be made of unripe Grapes, if it be mixt with ſo much Water as will corrupt the Wine, then is it not converted into the Blood of Chriſt.* Now by what means the perſon that adores the Sacrament, can be aſſured that the Bread and Wine is ſubject unto none of theſe defects, it is not eaſie to conceive.

[e] Si panis non ſit triticeus, vel, ſi triticeus, ſit admixtus granis alterius generis in tanta quantitate, ut non maneat panis triticeus, vel ſit alioqui corruptus: non conficitur Sacramentum. *ibid.* pag. 34.

[f] Si vinum ſit factum penitus acetum, vel penitus putridum, vel de uvis acerbis, ſeu non maturis expreſſum, vel admixtum tantum aquæ, ut vinum ſit corruptum, non conficitur Sacramentum. *ibid.*

Thirdly, [g] *If the Prieſt have no intention to conſecrate the Bread and Wine, if in this matter he acts diluſorily*, if he be a ſecret Atheiſt, a Moor, a Jew, in all theſe caſes the perſon Worſhiping muſt give *Latria* to a Creature; if none of all this happen, yet [h] if the Conſecrated *Prieſt* were not Baptized with due form of words, or if the Perſon that Baptized him, doth not intend to do as the Church doth, if he be not a *Prieſt*, (which often happens ſaith Pope * *Adrian*) and certainly falls out, when he that doth Ordain him, doth noth not intend to do ſo, or faultreth by diminution of, or by addition to the form of Ordination, ſo that the ſence is changed, or made imperfect; or laſtly, if the *Biſhop* that Ordain'd

[g] Siquis non intendit conficere, ſed deluſorie aliquid agere non conſecrat, quia requiritur intentio *ibid.* p. 35. 36.

[h] Quicquid horum deficit, ſcilicet materia debita, forma cum intentione, & ordo Sacerdotalis in conficiente, non conficitur Sacramentum. *ib.* p. 34. * In quæſt. quodlib. quæſt. 3.

this

this *Prieſt* that doth now Conſecrate, were not himſelf Ordained and Baptized with due matter, form, and intention, or if this happened to any *Prieſt* or *Biſhop* before him, or any one in the ſame Line of Ordainers till you come unto St. *Peter*; that is, if this hath happen'd out in ſixteen hundred years, then will the Elements remain ſtill Bread and Wine, as wanting Conſecration by a real *Prieſt*, for Baptiſm and Ordination being neceſſary requiſites to *Prieſthood*, he who by the defect of theſe is only a ſuppoſed *Prieſt*, can give but a ſuppoſed *Prieſthood*, and they that do receive their *Prieſthood*, or do derive it from ſuch as have received it from them, can receive nothing but a ſhadow, it being undeniably certain, that the unſupplyable defect of any neceſſary antecedent, doth cauſe a nullity in all thoſe conſequences which depend upon it. So that no *R. Catholick* can be aſſured he doth not Worſhip Bread, without the knowledge of thoſe things of which he can have no aſſurance, there being no neceſſity that they ſhould be true.

From the conſideration of all theſe defects, it is exceeding evident, That all that live in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, and daily practice the adoration of the Hoſt, are unavoidably ſubjected to the continual peril of Idolatry, and have juſt reaſon to ſuſpect (although the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation ſhould in the general be certain) that the material object of their Worſhip is but Bread and Wine. On this Objection *T. G.* reflects with ſo much inſolence and triumph, as if it were the vaineſt ſcruple that a tongue could utter, and had been managed by the Dr. with the greateſt weakneſs: And yet ſo little reaſon had he to be thus inſolent and pert, that by his firſt reply unto it, he hath quite

over-

overthrown the *Roman Cauſe*, and given all conſidering perſons, ſuch a clear convincing motive to deſert the Church of *Rome*, that nothing can be more prevailing. For thus he ſpeaks, *The abſurdneſs of the aſſertion, that another mans defect and wickedneſs ſhould make me incur the Crime of Idolatry, whether I will or no, might ſuffice to make any reaſonable man depoſe ſo Chimerical a ſcruple.* This I confeſs is a moſt clear and certain truth, that it is infinitely abſurd to ſay I ſhould be guilty of ſo great a Crime, only by reaſon of anothers fault or wickedneſs: But then it muſt be more abſurd to think I ſhall be damned only by reaſon of the defect or wickedneſs of others, which yet all *R. Catholicks* ſtand bound as firmly to believe, as any other Doctrine of that Church; for it is certainly the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, [a] *That where the perfect form of Baptiſm, or the intention of* [b] *doing what the Church doth, is wanting, the perſon that is brought unto the Font is not Baptized:* And it is alſo the definition of that Church, [c] *That Baptiſm is neceſſary to Salvation*, and conſequently, that no unbaptized perſon can be Saved; and hence the *Roman Ritual* ſpeaks thus, [d] *That Holy Baptiſm, the Gate of Chriſtian Religion and Eternal Life,*

a Quoties infans aut adultus verſatur in vitæ periculo, poteſt ſine ſolemnitate à quocunque Baptizari ſervata tamen forma & intentione *Eccleſiæ*, *Ritual. Rom.* de *Bap.* p. 7.

b Quicquid enim horum deficit, ſcilicet materia debita, forma cum intentione non conficitur *Sacramentum*. *Miſs. Rom.* p. 34.

c Siquis dixerit, Baptiſmum liberum eſſe, hoc eſt, non neceſſarium ad ſalutem; anathema ſit. *Concil. Trid. Seſs.* 7, de *Bapt. Can.* 5.

d *Ritual. Rom.* de *Bapt. p.* 5.

e Nihil magis neceſſarium videri poteſt, quàm ut doceatur omnibus hominibus Baptiſmi legem a Domino præſcriptam eſſe, ita ut niſi per Baptiſmi gratiam Deo renaſcantur, in ſempiternam miſeriam, & interitum a parentibus, ſive illi fideles, ſive infideles ſint, procreentur. Igitur ſæpiùs à Paſtoribus explicandum erit, quod apud Evangeliſtam legitur; Niſi quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ & ſpiritu non poteſt introire in regnum Dei. *Catechiſ. Rom. part.* 2. *Cap.* 11. §. 31.

is

is necessary to the Salvation of all Men, is testified by truth it self in these expressions, unless a Man be born again, &c. *and therefore in the due ministration of it, the greatest diligence is needfull.* (2.) It is most certainly the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, that Sinners are not absolved by the *Priest*, unless the [c] *Priest* intend to do it; and yet that Church defineth, That this [f] *Sacrament of Penance is necessary to Salvation to those that after Baptism do fall*; and tells the penitent, [g] *he must not so far flatter or deceive himself, as to expect to be absolved by God, by reason of his Faith, if the Priest doth not in his mind intend truly to absolve him, and to act seriously in the matter.* So that *T. G.* and all of his perswasion, must recant this principle which he hath here laid down, and which shines with the brightest evidence, or else he must renounce the Church of *Rome*, and one would wonder at the stupidity of our *R. Catholicks*, that they can think of this without the greatest horrour and amazement: for if this be not true, then their Religion must be false, and if it be, then how great soever be the Piety and Virtue of their Lives, yet if their *Priest* be a secret *Atheist*, if he be impious enough not to be serious, or if he be so negligent, or so malicious as not to intend their absolution, they must infallibly be damned to all Eternity.

[e] Siquis dixerit, in ministris, dum Sacramentum conficiunt & conferunt non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi quod facit Ecclesia, anathema, sit. *Concil. Trid. Sess. 7. Cap. 1: Can. 11.*

[f] Est autem hoc Sacramentum Pœnitentiæ lapsis post Baptismum ad salutem necessarium. ut nondum regeneratis ipse Baptismus. *ibid. Sess. 14. Cap. 2.*

[g] Non debet pœnitens adeò sibi de suæ ipsius fide blandiri, ut etiam si nulla illi adsit contritio, aut sacerdoti animus seriò agendi & verè absolvendi desit; putet tamen se, propter suam solam fidem, verè & coram Deo esse absolutum. Nec enim fides sine pœnitentia remissionem ullam peccatorum præstaret: Nec is esset, nisi salutis suæ negligentissimus, qui sacerdotem joco se absolvente in cognosceret, & non alium, seriò agentem, sedulò requireret. *ib. Cap. 6.*

Secondly,

Secondly, His instances are all impertinent, and insufficient to take off the scruple upon several accounts, as for example, *T. G. askes what certainty hath a Husband that the person he takes for his Wife, is so indeed; and yet a Husband may pay the conjugal debt.* P. 259.

Answer, The case is no way parallel, for here is no apparent cause of doubt, for otherwise the duty ought not to be paid, but there is *almost infinite reason* to suspect Christ is not present in the Sacrament; once in a Thousand instances perhaps it happeneth that a Man may be cheated with another Woman; but here it is an Hundred to one that we are cheated in our supposition of Christs Real and Corporal presence. For since the power of the *Priest* to Consecrate, depends upon the due Baptizing, and due Ordination of all that Line which was before him; should we allow to every Ordaining *Bishop* 16 years, yet must that Line contain an Hundred *Bishops* at least, and if but one neglect in matter, form, or the intention of the *Priest*, hath been committed in the Baptizing, or Ordaining of one of the whole Hundred Bishops, the Bread must certainly be Bread; so that the want of due intention, form or matter, being as common, and as like to happen in any single instance, as a cheat put upon the Husband; the disparity in this must be as great as that of One to an Hundred; and if we do again consider that according to the Canon of the *Nicene* Council, One Bishop, and Two Priests are requisite to the Ordaining of a Priest, then the disparity runs thus; as Three hundred to one, so is the possibility of being cheated in the Sacrament, to that of being cheated in my Bed: But

then if we consider that throughout the [a] *Ninth*, [b] *Tenth*, and [c] *Eleventh* Ages. The *Priests* and *Bishops* of the *Roman Church* were so abominably wicked, that Tongue cannot express sufficiently their vileness; that by their own confession 50 succeeding Popes were rather *Devils*, and *Apostates*, than *Apostolick Persons*, that their Sacrificators were [d] *Antichrists*, *Magicians*, *Invaders of the holy Function*, guilty of *Simony* and *Perjury*, Monsters and Prodigies of vice, and that on those accounts the Ages mentioned are called the *unhappy and the most desperate times*, *wherein the very* [e] *Abomination of Desolation had usurped the Temple*. If we consider that their ignorance was so exceeding great, that [f] *few knew what it was they read*. I say if these things be imparti-

[a] *Cent.* 9. In eodem concilio de vita & honestate sacrificulorum, quorum mores a Disciplina Majorum lapsi ad luxum libidinemque plus quam profano licet, tendebant, leges latæ sunt. *Avent. lib.* 4. *p.* 359.

Isti octo Pontifices sequentes brevi tempore sederunt, nescio notabile aliquid de ipsis dicere, quia non nisi scandalosa de ipsis reperi. *Fascic. p.* 67. Quod proinde seculum ab Historicis infælix inscribitur. *Genebrard. ad Ann. Christi*, 899.

[b] *Cent.* 10. Quo tempore ipsa Romana Ecclesia cæsura & interitura penitus videri potuisset, tot improbis, sceleratis, impudicis, Prædonibus invasoribus, sanguinariis & grassatoribus hoc seculo (*ut* audisti) sedem Apostolicam invadentibus. *Chron.* 1000.

[c] *Cent.* 11. Quam tunc deploratus fuerit status Ecclesiæ, & ferme monstro simillimus, cernere licet apud Sigebertum, Vincent. & Antoni. sacerdotes erant moribus depravatissimis, & propterea ipsi & res sacræ populo contemptibiles; quilibet ex plebe audebat de sacris mysteriis disputare; Sacramenta etiam ab Infantibus turpiter tractabantur; in extremo vitæ viaticum Dominicum contemnebatur; decimæ presbyteris debitæ igne cremabantur. Corpus domini sæpe pedibus conculcabatur & sanguis effundebatur, multaque alia scelera in Ecclesia patrabantur. *Genebrard. Chron.* 1079.

[d] Sacrificuli principibus a Deo datis, non solum non parendum esse, verum etiam fraude, vi quovis modo tollendos, populum Christianum docere audent; per jurja, homicidia, civilia bella, cædes, perfidiam, pietatem vocant, fidem frangentes, fœdera dissolventes, pactum prævaricantes, juramentum violantes, perfidos, atque perjuros non esse, sibi credi postulant. Quia eos, qui fideles sunt, qui

qui rebellionem, incendia facere, ſtupra, inceſtus committere, prædas agitare, proximos opprimere, cecidere, compilare, ſanguinem Chriſtianum effundere ſummopere cavent, in numero ſceleratorum atque impiorum computant, *&c. Aventinus Annal. Bojar. lib.* 5 *pag.* 591.

e Præfari aliquid neceſſarium duximus ne quid ſcandali pufillus animo pateatur ſi quando videre contigerit abominationem deſolationis in Templo. Baron a *An.* 900.

f Multo jam Tempore indoluit paternitas tua tantam in Eccleſia Dei invaleſcere inſcitiam atque tam Craſſam eorum qui Sancto miniſtrant altari, & divinas ex officio perſonant laudes, ignorantiam, ut rari admodum inveniantur, qui exactè & integrè quæ legunt aut canunt, intelligant, aut eorum, quæ ore expromunt, ſenſum capiant aut rectam teneant percipiantve ſententiam. *Clichtov. præfat. Elucidat. Eccleſ. vid. Nich. de Clemang. p.* 16. *Hotting de neceſſ. Reform. p.* 65.

ally conſidered; it muſt be highly probable to men of ordinary reaſon, that if the forementioned defects do certainly obſtruct the Sacrament of Ordination, there is not any Prieſt now living in the whole *Church of Rome.* This anſwer alſo ſhews that all his other inſtances are alſo wretchedly impertinent, and therefore cannot poſſibly deſerve to be particularly conſidered.

Were it moſt certain that every particular Hoſt were duly Conſecrated, and certainly contained Chriſts real Body, yet have we no good warrant upon that ſuppoſition to Adore it with Latria: *For as the* Dr. *excellently argues, the reaſon of all Adoration given to the Sacrament is this, that Chriſt hath ſaid,* this is my Body, *which words if they imply Tranſubſtantiation cannot be underſtood of any other change than of the Bread into Chriſts Body; and if this ſenſe were to be put upon them, why may I not imagine much more agreeably to the nature of the Inſtitution? That the mere humane nature of Chriſt is there, then that his Divinity ſhould be there in a particular manner preſent to no end, and where it makes not the leaſt manifeſtation of it ſelf:* To this diſcourſe *T. G.* returns this Anſwer, *That where there is a General command without ex-* Prop. 4. Sect. 4. P. 127. P. 234.

ception to Worſhip the word made Fleſh, there he hath given a ſufficient indication of doing it wherever we are certain by faith, that he is ſo preſent. Anſvver, But what is this to the *Doctors* Argument, which proceeds upon this ground, that the preſence of Chriſts Body in the *Euchariſt* is no ſufficient evidence, that in the *Euchariſt* it is united to the word; for if Chriſts Body may be eaten, and not eaten, eaten by them who have received the Hoſt, and not eaten by them who have not yet received it; If it may be under the ſpecies of Bread, and not under the ſpecies of Bread, under the ſpecies of Bread, as it is in the Sacrament, and not under the ſpecies of Bread, as it is in Heaven; why may it not be united to the word, and not united to the word, united to the word, as it is in Heaven; but not united to the word as it lyes ſenſeleſs on the Altar. And therefore the belief of Catholicks, that the Divinity is thus united to the Sacrament, is no ſufficient motive to Adore it with *Latria*, becauſe I can have no ſufficient reaſon to think it true.

P. 113. Secondly, The *Dr.* Argues thus, *if the Bread be converted into that Body of Chriſt which is hypoſtatically united with the Divine nature, then the converſion is not merely into the Body, but into the perſon of Chriſt; and then Chriſt hath as many bodies hypoſtatically united to him, as there are Elements conſecrated.* This clear perſpicuous Argu-

p. 241. ment is ſaith *T. G. A notable piece of new myſtical Divinity, and expreſs'd in hard words; and attended with a contradiction.* Anſwer, can it be expected that any man ſhould ſpeak of a Subject that is it ſelf made up of infinite contradictions, and not ſpeak ſutably to the Subject? if *T. G.* would aſſert the contrary to what the *Dr.* argues, muſt he not ſay that all the Conſecrated Ele-

Elements (perhaps a 1000) are but one Body, and seeing all these Elements are Christs Body, must not he say that a 1000 Christs bodys are but one Christs body? is it not impudence and disingenuity to cry out of hard words upon the mention of *Consecrated Elements*, and *Conversion into the person of Christ*, when we are speaking of that change which they call *Transubstantiation*, and say that it is made *by Consecration of the Elements*; or because we use that term of *hypostatick union*, when we are speaking of that union which is so called by all Divines that treat upon that Subject? and is delivered to us in that very word by the whole Church of Christ? *It doth not follow saith* T. G. *any more then because the Bread the Flesh, the Fish which he eat upon Earth were converted into the substance of his Body, and hypostatically united to him; it follows, That there were as many Bodies hypostatically united to him, as there were several meats eaten by him*: no saith he, *this Argument carries not the shew of probability*. *Rep.* Sure I am, this answer hath but the shew of a similitude; for the Elements of Bread are changed into Christs whole Body, but all the several meats Christ eat were not changed into Christs whole Body, but only into some part of it; but the similitude is good against him, for as the several meats which by Conversion became parts of Christs Body, were not the self same parts, but divers: So the several Wafers which by Conversion become Christs whole Body, are not the same whole Body, but divers; thus doth *T. G's.* similitude turn tayl upon him. And that the *Doctors* Argument is perfect demonstration is most evident, for it depends upon this proposition, that if one Consecrated Element be one Christs Body hypostatically united to him, then must Two, be Two; P. 241; 242.

and Ten be Ten, and many Consecrated Elements many Bodys; which is as evident as this, if one Twenty shillings in a bag be one pound, then must Two, be Two pound, and many Twenty shillings in a bag, must be many pounds.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The CONTENTS.

Prop. *The Bread and Wine are not Tranſubſtantiated,* 1. *Becauſe we do not drink blood.* 2. *Becauſe we do not eat mans Fleſh.* 3. *Becauſe mankind was not redeemed by the firſt Sacrament.* 4. *Becauſe the Scripture after Conſecration calls it Bread and Wine.* 5. *Becauſe our ſenſes have no evidence of ſuch a change.*

IN *the participation of the* Euchariſt *we do not eat the humane body of our Lord which ſuffered on the Croſs; nor drink of humane blood, but what we eat and drink is true ſubſtantial Bread and Wine:* for, 1. If Chriſt had given to his Diſciples blood to eat, he muſt have taught them to have done what was forbidden in the Law of *Moſes*, whereas he both exactly did obſerve that Law, and taught his own Diſciples to obſerve what ever by the *Scribes* and *Phariſees* was taught them from the Law of *Moſes*, which was in force till all things were fulfilled by the death of Chriſt. Secondly, Chriſts own Diſciples after his Reſurrection were ſtrict obſervers of the Law of *Moſes* for a conſiderable time; and ſo were alſo *many Thouſands of the Jewiſh converts.* St. *Peter* was ſo nice in obſervation of the Jewiſh Cuſtoms, that till a viſion had informed him better, he thought ſuch meat was utterly unlawful as was forbidden by the Law: and when in a viſi-

Prop. 1. Sect. 1.

Mat. 23. 3.

21 Act. 20

10 Act. 14.

on he was bid to *ſlay* and *eat*, he preſently cryes out, as a man tempted to an unlawful act; *not ſo Lord for I have never eaten any thing that is unclean.* St. *James* gives an account to *Paul* of
Act. 21. 20. the great zeal that all the Jewiſh Converts had for the Law of *Moſes*, in theſe words; *Thou ſeeſt Brother how many Thouſands of Jews there are which believe, and they are all zealous of the Law*; he declares how highly they were all offended with him, becauſe they were informed that he taught that they were not obliged to yield Obedience to the Conſtitutions and cuſtoms of the Jewiſh Law, verſ. 21. *They are* (ſaith he) *informed of thee, that thou teacheſt all the Jews which are among the Gentiles, to forſake* Moſes, *ſaying, that they ought not to Circumciſe their Children, neither to walk after their Cuſtoms*: And Thirdly, he exhorts him, for their better ſatisfaction; ſo to act, as that he might induce them to believe *that*
v. 24. *he alſo walked ſoberly and did keep the Law.* And yet St. *Peter* before this viſion, had aſſembled to celebrate the Holy Sacrament, and all theſe Jewiſh converts ſo zealous of the obſervation of the Ceremonial Law did very frequently receive
Act. 20. 7, 11. this *Cup of Bleſſing*; and upon every Lords day at leaſt, *did meet together to break Bread*; Whence evident it is that they did not look upon that action as any violation of the Law of *Moſes*, and ſo could not imagine that by participation of this Sacrament they drunk what properly was blood. For they could not be ignorant that blood
Lev. 3. 17. was by this Law forbidden, it having ſaid, *it ſhall be a perpetual Statute for your Generations throughLev. c. 7. v. 27. out all your dwellings, that ye eat neither Fat nor Blood*; and that, *whatſoever ſoul it be that eateth any manner of Blood, even that ſoul ſhall be cut off from his People.* Nor could they be both zealous obſer-

obſervators of the Law, and quarrellors with thoſe that did not keep it, and yet tranſgreſs it themſelves. The Sect of *Nazarens* continued in the Church of Chriſt 400 years, for of the [a] *Nazarens*, St. *Jerom* and St. *Auſtin* do make mention, they multiplyed and ſpread themſelves throughout the Eaſtern Church; and yet this Sect obſerved [b] all the Law of *Moſes*, and held it neceſſary to Salvation ſo to do, and therefore none of them did think that by participation of the Holy Sacrament they fed on blood, and ſo tranſgreſſed it.

[a] Sectæ illius memi-nit Hieronymus in Epiſt. ad Auguſt. & Auguſt. ipſe l. 4. con. Creſcon. Danæus in Auguſt. de Hæreſ. p. 75.

[b] Nazaræi cum Dei filium confiteantur eſſe Chriſtum, omnia tamen veteris legis obſervant. *Auguſt.* de *Hereſibus Cap.* 9. *vid. Epiphanium Hæreſ.* 29. §. 7.

Again, when the Diſciples met together to conſult of what was needfull to be obſerved by the *Gentile Converts*, the better to avoid the Scandal of the *Jews*, they ſtrictly charged them to *avoid things ſtrangled, and abſtain from Blood*; and judged it neceſſary ſo to do: Now had they fed on Blood in Holy Myſteries, no Chriſtian communicant could have obſerved this precept, and nothing could have been more fooliſh than to give injunctions to avoid that Scandal, which in their Holy Rites they daily miniſtred. This therefore is a ſignal and triumphant evidence, that they who firſt impoſed this Decree, and they who undertook to keep it, were utter ſtrangers to this idle dream of *Tranſubſtantiation*. The ancient Chriſtians did for many Centuries abſtain from Blood, & look upon it as a thing forbidden by this Canon, which enjoyns this abſtainance, and reckons it amongſt τὰ ἀναγκαῖα, or things neceſſary, of which we have ſufficient Teſtimony from that Acts 15. 28, 29.

Law of *Leo* the *Emperour*, where having forbidden the use of Blood stuffed in the entrails of Beasts, he affirms, That in the Old Law and in the Gospel, it was always esteemed impious to eat it: and in the *Canons* called [c] *Apostolical*, it is forbidden to a *Clergy-man to eat Blood, under pain of deposition; to a Lay-man under pain of Excommunication:* And hence the Penitential Books had warrant enough to impose Canonical Penances upon them that did tast this forbidden Dish: And that they did so, is known and confessed by *Pamelius*, *Rhenanus*, and *de la Cerda* upon these words of *Tertullian*, *Ne animalium quidem sanguinem in epulis esculentis habemus*; and being charged with the eating of the Blood of Infants, they, to evince the impudence and falseness of that charge, did constantly return this answer, [d] *That they who held it utterly unlawful to eat the Blood of Beasts, could not be guilty of Feasting on the Blood of Men:* whereas, had they conceived that, by partaking of the consecrated Cup, they drank of humane Blood, this answer could not have excused them, nor could it with sincerity be urged by them, since notwithstanding their abstaining from the Blood of Beasts, they daily fed upon his Blood, who was the Man *Christ Jesus*, and to depose a Priest from eating κρέα ἐν ἅιματι ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, (*i. e.*) *Flesh that contains the Blood*, as the fore-mentioned *Canon* doth, would in effect, be to depose him for pertaking of the Holy Sacrament, that being most emphatically κρέα ἐν ἅιματι ψυχῆς, *or Flesh with Blood*, according to the *Roman* Doctrine. And

c εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος ἢ ὅλως τοῦ καταλόγου τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ φάγῃ κρέα ἐν ἅιματι ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ καθαιρείσθω. τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ νόμος ἀπεῖπεν εἰ δὲ λαικὸς ἀφοριζέσθω. *Canonum Apostol.* cap. 62.

d Nobis homicidium nec videre fas nec audire tantumq; abhumano sanguine cavemus ut nec edulium peccorum in cibis sanguinem noverimus, *Minuc.* par. 34. cum notis *Ouzel.* porro quale est ut quos sanguinem pecoris horrere confiditis humano inhiare credatis? *Tertul. Apol.* c. 9. vid. *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l.* 5. c. 1.

there-

therefore this opinion, *that it was lawfull for Christians to eat Blood*, found little or no countenance in the Church of Christ, till the time of *Berengarius*, when this prodigious Doctrine came in voge; besides, the ancient Fathers objected this against the Heathens as a most horrible reproachful thing, [e] *That they made Covenants by drinking humane Blood*, and used that barbarous custom, as a *fit cure of the Falling Sickness*, now had this been the Christians daily practice to bind themselves by the participation of humane Blood, to the performance of all works of Piety, as *Pliny* saith they did, *by the participation of the Holy Sacrament*. Had they thus used humane Blood to cure the diseases of their Souls, and of their Bodies too, as [f] they did use the Holy Sacrament, what had been more a condemnation to the Christians then their own words and arguments; and what could lay upon them an imputation of greater impudence and folly, then to reproach the Heathens for doing what they daily practised? Besides, this they insisted on as a most pregnant evidence, that many of the Heathen Deities were wicked and pernitious Spirits, because [g] *a draught of humane Blood, or the Oblation of the Blood of Man*, was deemed an acceptable

[e] Quod Saturni filio dignum est mali & nocivi hominis sanguine sagi-natur ipsum credo docuisse sanguinis fœdere conjurare catalinam, & Bellonam sacrum suum haustu humani cruoris imbuere, & Comitialem morbum hominis sanguine, id est, morbo graviore sanare. *Minuc.* p. 34. de sanguinis pabulo & ejusmodi tragicis ferculis legite nec ubi relatum sit, (est apud Herodotum opinor) defusum brachiis sanguinem ex alterutro degustatum nationes quasdam fœderi comparasse, nescio quid & sub Catilina tale degustatum est *Tertul. Apol. c.* 9.

[f] Erat apud nos Acatius quidam honesto apud suos ortus loco qui clausis oculis natum se esse dicebat. Sed quia intus sani palpebris cohærentibus non patebant, medicum eos ferro aperire voluisse neq; hoc permisisse religiosam matrem suam, sed id effecisse ex Eucharistia Cataplasmare cum jam puer quinq; aut fere amplius esset annorum unde hoc se satis meminisse narrabat *August. l.* 3. *Sec. adv. Julian. Op. S.* 164.

[g] Hodie istic Bellonæ sacratos sanguis de femore prosciso in palmulam exceptus esui datus signat. *Tertul. Apol. c.* 9.

secrated

ſervice to them, and that which would appeaſe their anger, and becauſe their *Prieſts* were Conſecrated by drinking humane Blood. Now if the Chriſtians did daily offer humane Blood to God as a moſt acceptable Sacrifice; and if both Prieſt and People did as often drink it, as they did celebrate the Sacrament, what could theſe charges be, but indications of the ſtupidity and impudence of thoſe that made them?

Arg. 2. §. 2. Had Chriſt commanded his Diſciples to eat his real Fleſh, and feed for ever on that very body which ſuffered on the Croſs, he had delivered that which could not have been thought of, and much leſs practiſed without the greateſt horrour: For had he only taught them to eat humane fleſh, he had enjoyned them to do that which is repugnant unto humane nature, and hath been conſtantly eſteemed by the more ſober Heathens, a barbarous and inhumane thing. Hence that expreſſion of our Saviour Chriſt, *That they who would be made partakers of Eternal Life muſt eat his Fleſh*, was by the unbelieving *Jew*, rejected as a thing impoſſible, *how can this Man ſay, they give us his Fleſh to Eat?* And if they deemed it a thing impoſſible, that the whole Nation of the *Jews* ſhould eat of one mans Fleſh, well might the *Gentiles* think it impoſſible that they ſhould do ſo. Nay, when his own Diſciples heard it, they preſently cried out, *This is an hard ſaying, who can hear it:* they judged it ſo abſurd a Propoſition, and were ſo highly ſcandalized at it, that notwithſtanding all the conviction they received from their Eyes and other ſenſes, that he was the true *Meſſiah*, they think this one propoſal a ſufficient motive to reject him, *for from that very time many of his Diſciples went back, and walked no more with him.*

Joh. 6. 52.

verſe 60.

verſe 66.

So

So that our Blessed Saviour, to obviate and to remove this Scandal, doth in the judgment of the *Fathers*, presently expound himself in a Spiritual sence, and doth assert, that this corporal eating was unprofitable, and not the thing he did exhort them to, for thus *Eusebius* doth paraphrase his words, [g] *do not think that I speak of that Flesh wherewith I am compassed, as if you must eat of that, neither imagin that I command you to drink my sensible and bodily Blood, but understand well, that the words which I have spoken unto you, are Spirit and* [h] *Life*; This also is the Exposition of *Tertullian*, *Origen*, St. *Augustin*, *Athanasius*, to omit divers others: And of this Exposition they give this account, [i] that those expressions taken literally, command what is *an impious and* [k] *wicked think*, and are *a killing Letter*, and therefore must be taken in a Spiritual sence. And we are informed by [l] *Wowerius*, out of the Writings of *Pseudo Clemens*, that that accursed practice of the *Pepuzians*, *Quintilians*, and others, who mixt the Blood of Infants with the Eucharistick Bread, had its first rise from *Simon Magus*, misunderstanding those very words of *John*, *except you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man*

g Μὴ δὴ τὴν σάρκα ἣν περίκεισθαι νομίζετέ με λέγειν ὡς δεῖν αὐτὴν ἐσθίειν μηδὲ τὸ αἷμα πίνειν ὑπολαμβάνετέ με προστάττειν· ἀλλ' εὖ ἴσθι ὅτι τὰ ῥήματα ἃ λελάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ ζωή. ὥσθ' αὐτὰ εἶναι τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τὰς λόγους αὐτοῦ τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὸ αἷμα. *Euseb. l. 3. Eccles. Theol. contra Marcell. Ancyr. M. S. Bibl. Oxon.*

h *See Bishop* Ushers *answer to the* Jesuites, *p.* 48, 49, 50, 51.

i *August. de Doct. Christiana l.* 3. *c.* 15, 16.

k Est in N. Testamento litera quæ occidit eum qui non spiritualiter ea quæ dicuntur adverterit, si enim secundum literam sequaris hoc ipsum quod dictum est nisi manducaveritis carnem meam, &c. occidit hæc litera *Origen* in *Lev. c.* 10. *Hom* 7. p. 87.

l Horum ergo nefarii ritus Christianis imputati: ea autem immanitas cœpit a *Simone Mago*, ut *Narrat. Clem.* de rebus gestis *Petri*, qui perperam intellexerat illa *Johannis cap.* 6. nisi comederitis carnem filii hominis, & biberitis ipsius sanguinem, *&c. Not. in Min.* p. 34. vide *Elmenhorst.* in hæc verba *Minuc.* infans farre contectus, ut decipiat incautos, apponitur.

and

and drink his Blood, &c. Now if this oral manducation of the Flesh of Christ seemed so repugnant at the first view and apprehension to all that heard it, can we suppose it would pass down so glib, not only with the *Jewish*, but all the *Gentile* converts? and yet we do not find, that ever *Jew* or *Gentile* was offended at the participation of the Holy Sacrament, or that any Heathen or Apostate did object unto the Christians, that they were *Canibals* on this account, or that they did devour humane Flesh. When Christ was careful to prevent this gross conception in the *Jews*, can we believe that he should institute this oral manducation of his Flesh and Blood? or had this Doctrine been delivered by *Apostolical tradition*, and so received by the Church of Christ, could those renowned *Fathers* have pronounced the literal and proper acceptation of the words to be a *killing Letter*, *and the injunction of the greatest wickedness*? could they have thought that place of *John* was misinterpreted, by being used to countenance the eating humane Blood? or could those *Hereticks* have any need to fly to such accursed arts that they might truly eat Christs Blood? But then if we conceive this person, we thus devour, to be also God, and therefore look upon this action as θεοφαγία, or the devouring of our God and Maker, it is so full of horrour, scandal and amazament, that nothing can be more; for what this Doctrine doth assert, was in the judgment of the [a] Orator, such an incredible madness, as humane nature never could be guilty of: And *Averroes* upon this single score pronounceth, that [b] *among all Religi-*

[a] Ecquem tam amentem esse putas, qui illud quo vescatur Deum credat esse? de natura Deorum. C. 3.

[b] Qui dicit se Sectam Christianâ deteriorem aut ineptiorem nullam reperire, cujus sectatores suum quem colunt Deum denibus discerpunt & devorant. Vide *Perron* de *Euch.* l. 3. c. 29. p. 973.

ous

ous Sects, the Christians were the worst and most ridiculous, because, that God they Worshipped, they with their Teeth devoured and tore in pieces, Hence as the highest Calumny which the *Mahumetan* can cast upon us, we are by them reproached as [d] θεοφγάι, *or the devourers of our God*; and they are wont to say, that by thus eating of his Flesh, we use him worse then did the *Jews* that Crucified him. The ancient *Fathers* do agree in these, with *Cicero* and *Averroes*, and say with them, *That to adore what we do eat, is the extreamest sottishness*, and hence we often find this objected to the *Heathens*, as the most pregnant evidence of the absurdity of their devotions, and of the Gods they Worshiped, that what they Worshiped, they did also Sacrifice, and that they did devour him whom they adored, as *Tatian* and *Minutius* suggest. And *Origen* doth represent it as a most foolish thing, *That any Men should Worship that which was the food of other Nations*. *Theodoret* also doth affirm, *That* [e] *God foreseeing Men would fall to such extremity of madness, as to Worship Beasts, the better to restrain that Wickedness, did suffer us to eat them*, which he conceived to be the greatest bar unto this gross Idolatry, *because*, saith he, *it is the evtreamest of all folly, to Worship what we Eat*. He again adds, *That* [f] *God divided Beasts into clean and unclean, that Men abhorring what they judged unclean, and eating what they called clean, might Worship neither; for can any Man of sense*, saith he, [f] *conceive that to be God, which he abominates*

d Christianos atrociores esse in Christum quam Judæos (ait *Akmed Ben. Edris Mahummed:*) hos enim Christum occisum reliquisse, illos vero carnem ejus edere & sanguinem bibere, quod ipsa experientia teste truculentius esse affirmat. V. *Hotting. Apol. de Euch.* §. 14. p. 220.

e προορῶν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς, ὅτι ταῦτα πάντα θεοποιήσουσιν οἱ εἰς ἐσχάτην ἀλογίαν ἐκπεπτωκότες, συγχωρεῖ τὴν βρῶσιν ἵνα τὴν ἀσέβειαν παύσῃ, ἀβελτηρίας γὰρ ἐσχάτης τὸ ἐθιόμενον προσκυνεῖν *Quæst.* 55. *in Genesin.*

f *Quæst. in Gen.* 55. & in *Lev. Qu.* 11. p. 124.

as

as unclean, or which he offers to the true God, and himself doth Eat. Thirdly, he adds, *That God enjoyned the* Jews *to Eat and Sacrifice those Creatures which the* Egyptians *Worshiped as Gods, that they might be induced to despise what they did Eat and Sacrifice, and not be guilty of such extream stupidity and folly, as to conceive them to be Gods.* Had therefore this been the received Doctrine of the Church of Christ, it must have given greater scandal, and been a fitter matter of reproach to Christians, then was the scandal of the Cross, and therefore had it been the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, they would have been as careful to have removed this scandal, as that other of the Cross. The *Jews* and *Heathens*, who cast this always in their Dish, *That they did Worship him who lately suffered on the Cross*, would not have stuck to load them with this more hainous Crime of Eating and Devouring that very God they did adore, at least when this was frequently objected to them, as the extreamest madness, they must have presently retorted, *That you Christians confessedly do the same*, your God is also deemed your Sacrifice, and you do first adore, and then devour him: The ancient *Fathers* of the Church, who spent so many Writings and Apologies in vindication of that honour which they payed unto a Crucified Saviour, would surely have afforded some Apology for that, which in the Judgment of *Heathens*, *Turks*, and *Christians*, seems the greatest folly that can be charged on any Sect. Since then we never find, that *Christs Disciples*, or the *Ancient Fathers* were in the least concerned to remove the Scandal, since no *malitious Jew*, or *subtile Gentile*, did in the least accuse the Christians of what they all conceived a crime so monstrous; although they were not wanting to seek occasions

Serm. 7. de Sacrif. To. 4. p. 585.

occasions of reproach against them, and to divulge false stories of them, and were particularly upbraided with doing (what if this Doctrine had obtained amongst them) must be the Christians constant practice. Lastly, Seeing the ancient Fathers did pass as deep a censure on this θεοφαγία *or God-eating*, as the *Heathens* did, and looked upon it as an instance of the greatest madness and stupidity to Worship as a God what they did Eat and Sacrifice; And upon all occasions did upbraid the *Heathens* for being so exceeding mad and stupid. It must be infinitely certain, that they neither did nor could conceive this Doctrine to be the mind of *Christ* or his *Apostles*, or the received tradition of the Church of Christ.

If Christ when he administred this Sacrament did give to his Disciples his natural Body, and his proper Blood, then was his natural Body broken, and his Blood actually poured out before his Passion; for he administred this Sacrament before his Passion, and what he then administred was, if we may believe his words, τὸ σῶμα κλώμενον, (i.e.) *his broken Body*, and τὸ ποτήριον, or τὸ αἷμα ἐκχυνόμενον, (i.e.) *his blood shed or extravasated*; now since his body was then whole, and not yet broken on the Cross for us, seeing his Blood remained still in its proper Channels, and neither Heart nor Hand were pierced to let it out; and therefore what he did then administer, could not in any natural and proper sence be stiled his body broken, and his blood shed for us, his words must necessarily be interpreted in such a Tropical and Sacramental sence, as Protestants do plead for. Add to this, That if Christ gave his Body in the natural sence at the last Supper, then it was either a Sacrifice propitiatory, *Arg.* 3. §. 3.

or

or it was not; if it was not, then it is not now: and then their Dream of the *Mass* is vaniſhed, if it was propitiatory at the laſt Supper, then God was reconciled to all the world, and Mankind was redeemed before the Paſſion of our Bleſſed Saviour. For Chriſt expreſly ſaith, *that he then gave unto them his body, which was given for us, and his Blood ſhed for many for the remiſſion of Sins*: which if we literally underſtand, his future paſſion muſt be vain and needleſs, ſo dreadful are the conſequences of this portentous Doctrine.

Luk. 22. 19
Mat. 26. 28

Arg. 4. §. 4.

If we may credit the Apoſtle *Paul* what we receive in the participation of the Holy Sacrament is Bread, for after Conſecration he ſo ſtiles it, at the leaſt five times: *The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Chriſt, for we are all partakers of this Bread. Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that Bread, for as often as you eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, you ſhew the Lords Death, &c. Wherefore, whoſoever ſhall eat this Bread, and drink this Cup unworthily, ſhall be guilty of the Body and Blood of Chriſt.* In which expreſſions it is five times ſaid, that what we eat and do partake of, what is unto us the Communion of Chriſts Body, and ſheweth forth his Death, and therefore what is Conſecrated in this Holy Sacrament, is ſtill bread. And is it not a wonder that one paſſage mentioned by our Saviour, whilſt he was alive, and had his blood within his Veins, ſhould be eſteemed ſufficient to make us all believe that his whole body, and ſo his hand was in his hand, and that this Living Chriſt was alſo Dead and Sacrificed, and that his blood was ſhed before he ſuffered on the Croſs, and alſo that the ſame Body which was whole before the Eyes

1 Cor. 10. 16, 17.
1 Cor. 11. 28.
verſe 26.

of

of his Diſciples was alſo broken for them, and many thouſand contradictions more? and yet that what the Holy Ghoſt, who knew the meaning of our Saviours words as well as any *R. Catholick*, hath called ſo often Bread, and ſeems to all our ſences ſo to be, ſhould not be deemed ſufficient to make us think it Bread. If Chriſt had ſaid, *This is my Body*, and the Holy Ghoſt had never ſaid that it was *Bread*, we might have had ſome reaſon to ſuſpect our ſences in this matter: But when it is ſo oft in Scripture affirmed to be Bread, and is but once affirmed to be the Body of our Lord, and it is abſolutely neceſſary, that one of theſe two affirmations ſhould be acknowledged to be Tropical, that as great evidence as ſence and reaſon can afford in any caſe whatſoever, ſhould be of no effect at all or have no influence to move or to inſtruct our Judgments how to paſs ſentence in this caſe, but that it ſhould be thought as rational, all other circumſtances being equal, to determine againſt the greateſt evidence of ſence and higheſt reaſon, as to determin according to the verdict of them both, is moſt apparently abſurd. Add to this, that the Apoſtles buiſneſs in this place, was to reprove thoſe perſons who prophaned this Sacrament, and uſed it as Common Bread, and ſo diſcerned not the Lords Body; and to convince them of the greatneſs of the Sin committed by their unworthy eating of this Bread: and therefore it concerned him the better to convince them of ſo great a Crime, and to diſcover the vileneſs of this prophanation, to have expreſly told them, That what they thus prophaned, *was the very Son of God that ſuffered for them*; this being a moſt ſignal aggravation of their guilt; whereas to ſay ſo often

1 *Cor.* 11. 26, 27, 28.

that it was Bread, was to extenuate the Crime, and therefore we may rationally presume St. *Paul* would have expresst himself not as we Protestants are wont to do; but according to the Judgment of the Roman Catholicks, had he believed as they do.

Argum. 5. Sect. 5. God never wrought a miracle in confirmation of the Faith of any body, but he still represented it unto their sences, and made it apparent to their eyes, ears, feeling, or their experience that he wrought it; there is not one instance to be given to the contrary from Scripture, or any humane Writer; the Devil himself is not so impudent as to require his servants to believe he works a wonder without some cunning slight to cheat their sences, and make them seem to see, hear, or tast, what really they do not. To this convincing evidence and demonstration, *T. G.* returns this sorry answer, P. 293. *that such miracles as are done for the Conversion of unbelievers; ought to be objects of our sence, but this is not done upon such an account, but for the Sanctification of those that believe already, and for these it is enough, that Christ hath said it is his body, they know very well the danger of not believing him more than their sences*: Answer, 1. We have in Scripture many instances of Miracles done not for the Conversion of unbelievers, but for the benefit of those that did believe, and such were all the standing Miracles that are recorded in the Book of *Moses*, the Manna, the water of Jealousie, the *Urim* and *Thummim*, &c. Such also were all the Miracles that the Apostles wrought on the diseased Christians; if then in all those Miracles we cannot find one instance which was not made apparent to the senses of mankind, what reason have we to esteem this so? Besides is not a Miracle, σημεῖον, or a sign? sure I am the Scripture often calls it so,

ſo, and is not every ſign declared by St. * *Auſtin* to be ſomething ſenſible, whereby we do perceive what is not ſenſible, what therefore is no object of the ſence, can be no ſign or Miracle. Secondly, we cannot poſſibly obtain a greater evidence that any Revelation is Divine, than is the evidence of ſence, whence it doth follow, that we can have no reaſon to believe a Revelation more than we do our ſences: as *T. G.* aſſerts; for all the certainty we have of any object of our Faith depends on our aſſurance, that the deliverers of it were infallibly aſſiſted by the Divine Wiſdom in that delivery: and is not this atteſted by the Miracles they wrought, the Propheſies they delivered, the Doctrine they taught? and that by ſence? ſhould any of them be queſtioned, muſt not we recur unto the ſences of the Primitive Chriſtians to confirm them? and muſt they not then be the ultimate foundation of our Faith, and our Traditions? muſt we not be ſurer of the proof, than of the thing proved? And conſequently of the evidence of ſenſe, than that of Faith, which deriveth from it? if not, why, Secondly doth our Lord pronounce them rather Bleſſed, who *believe and have not ſeen*, than *Thomas* who firſt ſaw and felt, and then believed? is it not becauſe they do it upon leſſer (though ſufficient) evidence? and ſo their Faith is more illuſtrious and praiſe worthy. Thirdly, ſhould it be otherwiſe, how cometh it to paſs that men are equally aſſured of what equally they ſee, but have not the like fulneſs of perſwaſion in what they believe? That being once aſſured of the objects of ſence; they can admit of no greater certainty, whereas after all our boaſts of a *Plerophory* of Faith, we have ſtill need to ſtrive and labour to encreaſe it? Since then the certainty of

* Signum eſt res præter ſpeciem quam ingerit ſenſibus aliud aliquid, ex ſe faciens in cogitationem venire. De Doctrina Chriſtiana, l. 2. c. 1.

20 Joh. 29

Faith is proved inferior to that of ſence. It is not poſſible we ſhould have greater reaſon to believe a Revelation, or any matter of our Faith, than to believe our ſences as *T. G.* ſuggeſts: hence alſo it doth follow that we can have no greater reaſon to believe that theſe four words, *this is my body*, are contained in Scripture, or that they do aſſert the Sacrament to be Chriſts Body, than that aſſurance which the ſences of all Chriſtians do afford us, that it remaineth Bread. And Thirdly, hence it follows, that we can have no greater reaſon to profeſs the Chriſtian Faith, than we have to reject the Figment of *Tranſubſtantiation.*

Anſwer, 3. As for that vain pretence that Chriſt hath ſaid, *this is his Body*, and therefore we ſtand bound to think that he doth work a Miracle to make it ſo, although it be againſt the ſence and reaſon of mankind that he ſhould do it: This will oblige us alſo to believe, that by ſome other like prodigious Miracle before his Incarnation he was Tranſubſtantiated into the Rock, which miniſtred water to the *Jews* during their Travels in the Wilderneſs, for of that it is expreſly ſaid ἡ πέτρα ἦν ὁ χριστὸς, or *that Rock was Chriſt*; 2. This will oblige us to believe that Chriſt hath neither Fleſh nor Blood, becauſe the Scripture doth aſſure us *that Fleſh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*, which yet *Chriſt Jeſus* doth inherit. We unbelieving *Proteſtants* perhaps might think it ſtrange *that Chriſt ſhould have neither Fleſh nor Blood; & yet the Sacrament ſhould be his very Fleſh and Blood*, but as for you, *you know the danger of not believing God more than your ſences, and your reaſons*, and therefore this and many thouſand contradictions of like nature can be no reaſon why you ſhould not embrace the Letter. 3. This will oblige us to be

1 Cor. 10. 4.

1 Cor. 15. 50.

An-

Anthropomorphites, and to confeſs that all the arguments which have been urged againſt that Tenet by the Church of Chriſt are vain and ineffectual, for Scripture hath not only ſaid that man was made after the likeneſs and ſimilitude of God, but alſo doth in very many places attribute unto him the parts and members of an humane body, what then will you oppoſe againſt them? ſence, and reaſon? *T. G.* will give this anſwer for them, *that they well know the danger of not believing Holy Scripture more than their ſences, or their reaſon.* Will you confute them by a Text of Scripture, which ſeems to contradict their Doctrine? alas! that which is often ſtiled Bread muſt not be thought to be ſo, becauſe Chriſt hath once ſaid it is his body, and can we be ſo vain as to imagine that one ambiguous paſſage πνεῦμα ὁ θεὸς, which may be rendred, God makes, or ſearcheth, God loves, or ſeeks the Spirit, ſhould carry it againſt ſo many which more expreſly do aſcribe unto him the members of an humane body? or ſhall we fly unto Tradition; alas! is it not that which is derived from the ſences of thoſe men which in the matter of Tranſubſtantiation have been all conſtantly deceived? and if their hearing be a ſufficient ground of Faith againſt the Doctrine of the *Anthropomorphites*, muſt not their eyes, and taſt, and ſmell, and feeling be as cogent againſt the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation? Fourthly, This muſt oblige us to believe what is the greateſt Blaſphemy, *viz.* That Chriſt by all the Miracles he wrought among them, gave no ſufficient motive to the *Jews* to own him for the true Meſſiah, for all his Miracles were only motives to believe that Law ſhould be aboliſhed, which God hath often ſaid ſhould laſt, לעולם, or *for ever*. Doth not he tell them

4 Joh. 24.

that the things he had revealed belonged to them,
Deut. 29. 29. *and to their Children for ever, that they might do all the things of this Law.* Doth not he call the
Exod. 12. 17. Paſſover *an everlaſting Statute*; Hath not he ſaid the Law of their firſt fruits *ſhall be a Statute for*
23 Lev. 14 *ever throughout their Generations?* And if you anſwer that this word *Gnolam* doth not alwayes ſignifie an infinite duration, but is ſometimes uſed for ſuch duration as admits a period, and ſo muſt not be urged againſt ſo great conviction of their ſence and reaſon. Will not this anſwer juſtifie the Proteſtants when they produce ſo many inſtances to ſhew, that when a thing in Scripture is ſtiled this or that, the meaning only is, that it doth ſignifie what it is ſaid to be: for
40 Gen. 12. 41 Gen. 26. 7 Dan. 38. 8 Luk. 11. 13 Mat. 38. 39. to omit thoſe paſſages ſo often cited, *viz.* The three branches are three days: The ſeven Kine and ſeven ears of Corn, are ſeven years: The four great Beaſts, are four Kingdoms: Thou art that Golden head: The Seed is the word, the Field is the World, the Reapers are the Angels; the Harveſt is the end of the World; the Rock is Chriſt, *&c.* Should we omit, I ſay all theſe, and many other inſtances of this familiar Trope, it would be eaſie to produce many expreſſions of the like import with them: For doth not the
5 Ezek. 5. Scripture ſay of that ſame hair which by *Ezekiel* was burnt, and cut, and bound up in his skirt, this is *Jeruſalem*? And of that water which the
2 Sam. 23. 17. three mighty men procured for *David*, this is the Blood of the men that went in Jeopardy of their lives? Have we not clear and pregnant inſtances of Sacramental Tropes in Scripture, and in Jewiſh Writers? doth not our Saviour call the Paſchal-lamb the Paſſover? doth not he ſay the Cup is the New Teſtament? and was it not familiar with the Jewes to ſay of their unleavened Bread

Bread, *this is that Bread of affliction which our Fathers did eat*, and of the Lamb that it was *Corpus Paſchatis*, or the memorial of the Paſſover: And is it therefore any abſurdity to think Chriſt ſhould affirm of Sacramental Bread, deſigned to ſignifie and repreſent his Body broken for us, and to conveigh the bleſſings he had purchaſed, by the oblation of it on the Croſs, *This is my Body*? Buxt. de Cœna Dom §. 25.

Fifthly, This Anſwer will render us unable to confute the *Marcionites*, the *Valentinians*, and the *Manichæans*, who thought Chriſts Body to be only the appearance of a Body, and ſo denied the Article of his Incarnation and his real Paſſion. This fond imagination, the ancient Fathers did confute by *Mediums*, which overthrows this anſwer, and the whole Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation; nor can it be ſufficiently confuted by men of *T. G*'s. Principles. 1, The ancient Fathers did confute it from this principle, that we muſt certainly believe the evidence of Sence; and that to doubt the certainty of what our ſences apprehend, is to endanger all Religion.

Tertullian diſcourſeth thus, [a] *it is not lawful to doubt of our Sences, leaſt the ſame doubt be made concerning Chriſt, leaſt peradventure it ſhould be ſaid, he was deceived when he heard the voice of his Father teſtifying concerning him. Recite the Teſtimony of St.* John,, *what we have heard with our Ears, and our Eyes have ſeen, and our Hands have handled of the word of Life, that declare we to you. The Teſtimony verily is falſe, if nature do*

a Non licet nobis in dubium ſenſuſiſtos revocare, ne & in Chriſto de fide eorum deliberetur. Ne forte dicatur quod falſò patris vocem audierit de ipſo teſtificatum. Recita *Johannis* teſtimonem quod vidimus inquit quod audivimus, quod manibus noſtris palpavimus *&c.* falſa utique teſtatio ſi oculorum & aurium & manuum ſenſus natura mentitur. de anima *Cap.* 17. *B. C*

deceive us in the Teſtimony of our Eyes and Ears, and Hands: And in his Book *de Carne Chriſti*, he ſpeaks thus, [b] *He that doth introduce the Tenet of the Imaginary Fleſh of Chriſt, hath equal reaſon to introduce an imaginary Nativity, and to aſſert the Conception, Pregnance, and the Virgins Birth, and the whole Order of the Infant was Phantaſtical: for they would only have deceived the ſame Eyes and Sences which were deceived by the opinion of his Fleſh.* 2. They argue thus, that if Chriſt had no real Fleſh, and if he did not ſuffer really, the Sacrament cannot duely be ſtiled the Image, Figure, Symbol, Type, Similitude, Memorial or Repreſentation of his real Fleſh. [c] *Chriſt* (ſaith *Tertullian*) ſaid, *This is my Body*, (i. e.) *the figure of my Body; but it had been no figure, unleſs the Body had been true: for a Phantaſme can have no figure. But what he would have Bread to ſignifie, he hath ſufficiently declared, calling Bread his Body*: and therefore thus he ſums up his diſcourſe [d] *againſt the Phantaſme* of Marcion; *We have proved the verity of Chriſts Body and Blood by the Sacrament of Bread and Wine*: And *Maximus*, who flouriſhed *Anno Dom.* 190. diſcourſeth thus, [e] *If Chriſt, as theſe Men ſay, were without Body and Blood, of what kind of Fleſh, or of what Body, or of what kind of Blood did he give the Bread and*

b Sed & qui carnem Chriſti putativam introduxit æque potuit nativitatem quoq; phantaſma confingere, ut & conceptus, & prægnatus & partus Virginis & ipſius exindeinfantis ordo δοκήσει haberentur, eoſdem oculos, eoſdemque ſenſus fefelliſſent quos carnis opinio eluſit. *cap.* 4.

c Acceptum panem & diſtributum Diſcipulis corpus illum ſuum fecit, hoc eſt corpus meum dicendo, id eſt figura Corporis mei. Figura autem non ſuiſſet, niſi veritatis eſſet Corpus. Cæterum vacua res, quod eſt phantaſma, figuram capere non poſſit. Quid tunc voluerit ſignificaſſe panem ſatis declaravit corpus ſuum vocans panem *Tertul.* contra *Marcionem* l. 4. c. 40.

d Panis & calicis Sacramento jam in Evangelio probavimus corporis & ſanguinis Dominici veritatem adverſus phantaſma Marcionis. l. 5. c 8

e Apud Orig. Dial. 3. part. 2.

Cui?

Cup to be Images of, when he commanded his Disciples by them to make a Commemoration of him? Theodoret against the *Eutichians*, disputeth thus: [f] *That the Flesh of Christ was not transformed into the nature of the Godhead, because that Christians do participate of the Signs of his Body.* Now had this been the Doctrine of the Church of Christ, that this blessed Sacrament contained his very Flesh and Blood, they had much weakned their argument by those expressions; for what is more convincing then this inference, if Christians in the Sacrament, do eat Christs real Flesh and Blood, then must his Flesh and Blood be real; if they do eat Christs real Body, he had a real Body. Secondly, Why do they so absurdly and untruly set the Sacrament in opposition to Christs real Body, as the Figure stands opposed to the Truth. Thirdly, why do they all expresly say, the Bread and Wine are Types and Symbols, and Remembrances of his Body and Blood; and that of them he said, *This is my Body and my Blood*, seeing such Speeches cannot properly be true, but must admit a Figure. But Secondly, These *Hereticks* can never be confuted by Men of *T. G*'s. Principles, for hath the *Roman Catholick* one Text of Scripture to build his Dream upon, so hath the *Marcionite* that passage of St. *Paul*, which tells us, that as in the Eucharist we have the shape of bread, and yet no real bread, so Christ was σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, *in the shape of Man, and yet no Man*; as we have there the likeness of Wine, and yet no Wine, so Christ whilst he conversed in the World, was ἐν ὁμιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, *in the similitude of Man*,

[f] Ορθ. ἐν πέ τοίνυν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τίνων ἐστί σύμβολα ερα τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ σώματός τε καὶ αἵματος Ορθ. τοῦ ὄντως σώματος ἢ οὐκ ὄντως ερα. ὄντως. Ορθ. ἄριστα χρῆ δὲ εἶναι τὸ τῆς εἰκόνος ἀντίτυπον, εἰ τοίνυν τοῦ ὄντως σώματος ἀντίτυπά ἐστι τὰ θεῖα μυστήρια, σωμα ἄρα ἐστι καὶ νῦν τοῦ δεσπότου τὸ σῶμα οὐκ εἰς θεότητος φύσιν μεταβληθεὶς, ἀλλὰ θείας δόξης ἀναπλησθέν. Διαλ. 2. *To.* 4. p. 84, 85.

but

but yet no Man. If you ſhould urge againſt them ſence and reaſon, they will anſwer with *T. G.* Chriſtianity hath taught them to renounce them; or if you urge againſt them all thoſe places of Scripture which affirm Chriſt to have a Body, they may anſwer, *it was in Scripture called a Body, becauſe it ſeemed to be ſo*: For this is that very anſwer which *R. Catholicks* do give to all thoſe places of Scripture which ſay the Sacrament is after Conſecration Bread and Wine.

§. 6. But *Chryſoſtom* and *Cyril* ſeem to ſay, we muſt not in this matter truſt the Judgment of our Hom. 82. our Sences. The words of *Chryſoſtom* are theſe, *Let us obey God in all things, and not gainſay him, though what is ſaid, ſeem to contradict both our Imaginations and our Eyes. Let his word obtain more credit from us, then our thoughts or ſight. And let us behave our ſelves in the Myſteries, not beholding only thoſe things which lye before us, but holding faſt his words. For his Word is infallible, but our ſences are eaſie to be deceived. That never fails, but this moſt frequently miſtakes. Becauſe therefore the word ſaith, this is my Body, let us obey and believe, and behold him with the Eyes of our underſtanding.* Anſw. Theſe words are Hyperbolical and high, but muſt be ſoberly interpreted, viz. *That we muſt not finally reſolve all into Sence, but we muſt certainly believe, that howſoever the Sences do perceive nothing but common ordinary Bread and Wine, yet by Gods power they are changed into a ſupernatural uſe and operation, and that by thoſe ſenſible things, ſpiritual bleſſings are conveighed unto us.* That this is the true ſence of this expreſſion, and that it cannot be deſigned to intimate the change of Bread into Chriſts Body, ſo that the accidents of Bread alone remain, is evident, Firſt, from the words im-

immediately following: [g] *For Christ delivered to us nothing sensible, but by things sensible, things which are intelligible; for so it is in Baptism by a thing sensible*, viz. *Water, the gift*, to wit, *Regeneration and Renovation is performed.* Where note, 1, That the τὸ νοητόν, or the intelligible thing conveighed in the Sacrament, is said to be conveighed αἰσθετοῖς πράγμασι, by things sensible, (i. e.) by such things sensible as Water. Wherefore the things sensible are no more Transubstantiated, then is that Element in Baptism. Secondly, the thing intelligible, or the τὸ νοητόν, conveighed by Baptism, makes but an accidental change, a renovation, consisting not in the conversion of the nature, but in the addition of Grace to Nature. So the τὸ νοητόν conveighed by this holy Sacrament, must not impart the Transubstantiated Bread, but Bread converted in its use and operation by the addition of Spiritual Grace. And therefore what he here declareth touching the Holy Eucharist, he elsewhere doth apply to Baptism in these words, *let us believe Gods word, for it is more certain then our sight; for the sight is oftentimes deceived, whereas Gods word can never fail.* And speaking of the poor he saith, *when we are charitable to them, let us be so affected as if we gave to Christ himself, for his words are more certain then our sight.* So that we may from these expressions with equal reason argue, that the Baptismal Water is Transubstantiated, and that the poor man is truly changed into Christ, as that the Sacramental Signes are changed into his Body and his Blood. This is apparent Secondly, from what he doth affirm of all good Christians, viz. [i] *That their Tongues are red with the Blood of Christ, that they are nourished and so mixed with him,*

[g] οὐδὲν γὰρ αἰσθητὸν παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ χριστός. αλλὰ αἰσθήτοις μὲν πράγμασι πάντα δὲ νοητά. οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῷ Βαπτίσματι δι' αἰσθητοῦ μὲν πράγματος γίνεται τοῦ ὕδατος τὸ δῶρον. Νοητὸν δὲ τὸ ἀποτελούμενον ἢ γένησις καὶ ἀνακαίνησις. *Hom.* 82. *in Matt. p.* 513. l. 41.

[i] τὴν γλῶσσαν

τὴν φοινισσομένην ἅμαξι φρικῶδε στάτῳ. p. 514. l. 16. ἀναφύρει ἑαυτὸν ἡμῖν: καὶ οὐ τῇ πίστει μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ πράγματι σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἡμᾶς κατασκευάζει. 1 B. *l.* 13. σῶμά ἐστι χριστοῦ καὶ τοῦτ' ἐν πλῆθος. p. 513. l, 21.

him, that they are Christs own Flesh and Body and that *the whole multitude is the Body of Christ* Thirdly, from what he adds of wicked Men, viz. 1. [k] *That Christ doth not give his Body to them by the Mysteries*, which is impossible, if both the Bread and Wine contain his Body. And Secondly, That the Table, and the place which they resort to, is [l] *that same very Table, and that same very upper room in which Christ with his own Disciples did eat the Passeover*, viz. because it doth contain the same Spiritual Viands. And therefore may he not be thought to say his Sacramental Body is indeed the same which suffered on the Cross, because it doth conveigh unto us the same Blessings which he purchased by it? Hence in this Homily, he doth not only call the Bread and Wine * *the Symbols of Christs Body*, but he confutes the *Encratitæ* by asserting, that in those Holy Mysteries our Lord delivered Wine, (i. e.) the fruit of the Grape.

[k] ἑνὶ γὰρ ἑκάστῳ τῶν πιστῶν ἀναμίγνυσιν ἑαυτὸν διὰ τῶν μυστηρίων: καὶ οὓς ἐγέννησεν ἐκτρέφει δι' ἑαυτοῦ: καὶ οὐκ ἄλλῳ ἐκδίδωσι, p. 514. l. 27.

[l] αὕτη ἐκείνη ἐστιν ἡ τράπεζα: καὶ οὐδὲν ἔλαττον ἔχει, οὐ γὰρ ἐκείνην μὲν ὁ χριστὸς ταύτην δὲ ἄνθρωπος δημιουργεῖ; ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην αὐτός. τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἀνώγεων, ἔνθα ἐκεῖνοι τὸ τε ἦσαν. p. 514. l. 38.

* P. 510. l. 36.

Catech. Myst. p. 237, 238.

The words of *Cyril*, viz. *Consider this is not meer Bread and Wine, for it is the Body and Blood of Christ, according to the words of Christ himself. And although sence do suggest this to thee,* (viz. that it is ψιλὸς ἄρτος, Common Bread) *yet let Faith confirm thee. Do not judge of the thing by thy*

thy taſt, but know, and hold for moſt certain, that this Bread which is ſeen of us, is not Bread, though the taſt judge it to be Bread, but the Body of Chriſt, and that the Wine which is ſeen by us, although it ſeem Wine to the ſence of taſting, notwithſtanding is not Wine, but the Blood of Chriſt. I ſay, theſe words, if we conſider well the context, cannot admit of any other ſenee then that which we have given to the words of *Chryſoſtom:* For 1. he doth expreſly tell us, *that Chriſt pronounced* περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου, of [m] *the Bread, this is my Body*; and immediately before theſe words he gives this caution, *look not upon theſe things as upon common Bread and Wine.* Now even Romaniſts themſelves confeſs, [n] *that if the words, this is my Body did make this ſence, This Bread is my Body, this Sentence muſt either be taken tropically, that Bread may be the Body of Chriſt ſignificatively, or elſe it is plainly abſurd and impoſſible: for it cannot be, that Bread ſhould be the Body of Chriſt. It is the nature of this Verb Subſtantive* Eſt, *or* Is, ſaith **Salmeron, that as often as it joineth and coupleth together things of divers natures, which by the Latines are termed* Diſparata; *there we muſt of neceſſity run to a Figure and Trope. And therefore ſhould we have been conſtrained to fly to a Trope: if he had ſaid, this Bread is my Body, this Wine is my Blood, becauſe this had been a predication of Diſparates, as they call it.* 2. That you may be aſſured that by denying it to be ἄρτος ἄλλος, and οἶνος ἄλλος, he only meant to ſay it was not Bread without the Grace of Chriſt, and the aſſiſtance of his Spirit to conveigh the Bleſſings Chriſt hath purchaſed, but did not mean that it was Bread converted into the real Body of our Lord; He tells us the mutation is like to that of Ointment uſed in Baptiſm, *Be careful*, ſaith he, *that you do not think this*

[m] μὴ πρόσεχε ὧν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου· σῶμα καὶ αἷμα χριστοῦ τὴν θεοποιὸν τυγχάνει ἀπόφασιν *Catech. Myſt.* 4. p. 237. D.

[n] *Bellarm. de Euch.* l. 1. c. 1. & l. 3. c. 19. * *Tom.* 7. c. 20.

Gatech. Myst. 3. p. 235. A.

this is meer Oyntment: for as the Eucharistick Bread, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος ἁπλοῦς ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ, *is not yet meer Bread, but Christs Body: Even so that Holy Oyl,* (as one may say) *is not after the Consecration meer and common Oyl, but it is the Grace or Gift of Christ, and is effective of the presence of the Holy Ghost:* It is not common Bread, saith he, it is therefore Bread, it is Christs Body, as the Ointment is the Grace of Christ: but Grace it is, not by Conversion, for it remaineth Ointment still, but by the Accession of Grace unto it, and by the presence of the Spirit with it. 3. He adds,

Catech. Myst. 4. p. 287. C.

That when Christ said, except you eat my Flesh, &c. *the Jews were scandalized, as thinking, that he had advised them to Sarcophagy, not understanding his words Spiritually.* This Eating of Christs Flesh must therefore be Spiritual, and not *Sarcophagy*, or Eating of Christs real Flesh, which yet we cannot rationally deny, if we do literally interpret that passage of St. *John*; or with the *Romanists*, conceive that what we in the Holy Sacrament do eat, is that same Flesh of Christ which hung upon the Cross.

Lastly, if both these Fathers had intended to assert, that notwithstanding the Judgment of our Senses to the contrary, we stand obliged to believe the Sacrament to be that very Flesh and Blood which Christ did offer on the Cross: We have two others to oppose against them, who do expressly argue, that it remains still Bread and Wine, because our Senses judge it so to be, [o] *That which you see* (saith St. *Augustine*) *is the*

[o] Quod ergo vidistis panis est & Calix quod vobis etiam oculi vestri renuntiant, *Aug. in Ser. de Sacr.* apud *Bedam* in 1 Cor. 10. & *Ratramum* de *Corp. & Sang.* Domini, vel in *Serm.* de verbis Domini ut citatur ab *Algero* l. 1. *de Sacr.* c. 5.

Bread

Bread and the Cup which your very Eyes do declare [p] ὅρατά *unto you. The Sacramental Signs do still retain* ἐστι καὶ *their Essence and their Nature,* saith [p] *Theodoret,* ἁπτὰ οἷα *And both our Eyes and Feeling tell us, they are* καὶ πρό *what they were before.* We conclude then with τερον ἦν. that of *Chrysostom,* [q] *by these Sences we exactly learn all things, and we are conceived worthy of credit in teaching what we have received from the informations of our Eyes and Ears, as not being guilty of fiction or falshood in those matters.*

Theod. Dial 2. C. 24.

q Hom. 29. in *Joh.*

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Contains 1. *The judgment of Antiquity againſt Tranſubſtantiation.* 2. *An Anſwer to* T. G's. *allegations from the Fathers.* 3. *The pretended Confeſſions of the Proteſtants.* 4. *The Confeſſions of many Roman Catholiks, that Tranſubſtantiation is a novell upſtart Doctrine.* 5. *The Judgment of Antiquity, declaring with unanimous conſent, that the Sacrament is but the Figure, Type, the Symbol, or Memorial of Chriſts Blood and Body, and not that ſelf ſame Body which ſuffered on the Croſs, and that ſame Blood which he then ſhed, as to the Nature and the Subſtance of them.* 6. *A Corollary in vindication of the* Dr. *from the vain Cavils of* T. G.

HAving thus confirmed our Doctrine from Scripture, Common Sence, and Reaſon, we might by infinite Demonſtrations ſhew, that it hath alſo the perpetual conſent of all Antiquity: Why elſe do they inform us, That [a] *the ſubſtance of our Fleſh is nouriſhed and augmented*

[a] τὴν δὲ εὐχῆς λόγῳ τῆς παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφὴν ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν ἐκείνου τοῦ σεσαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι. *Juſtin. Dial.* 2. p. 28. *A. Ed. Pariſ.* 1636.

by

by this Holy Sacrament.) is a truth ſo clear, that Roman Doctors do confeſs it, and there needs nothing but experience for confirmation of it to any that dares queſtion or diſpute it.) For neither can the accidents augment or nouriſh; nor can we without Blaſphemy aſſert, That Chriſts whole Body is properly converted into the ſubſtance of all thoſe that do receive it. Why do they tell us, that albeit the Sacramental Signes do change their names after the Conſecration, yet do they ſtill [d] *retain their former Natures?* Why do they tell us, That [e] *of that Sacrifice which Chriſt did offer on the Croſs, we neither do nor may partake?* Why do they ſay, that *bread* is by our Saviour ſtiled his body, [f] *which is made up of many Cornes, and that Wine his blood, which is preſſed out of many Grapes?* Why do they frequently pronounce, that Chriſt affirmed *of the bread*, this is my body, and *of the Wine*, this is my blood? I might be endleſs in theſe Interrogatives, but I ſhall only add three things.

[b] Species Sacramentales per eandem rationem poſſunt converti in corpus humanum per quam poſſunt converti in Cineres vel in vermes & in deo manifeſtum eſt quod nutriunt, *Aquin.* part. 3. qu. 77. *Art.* 6.

[c] Et quoniam membra ejus ſumus & per creaturam nutrimur, creatura autem ipſe nobis præſtat ſolem ſuum oriri faciens & pluens quemadmodum vult, *eum calicem qui eſt Creaturæ* N. B. ſuum ſanguinem qui effuſus eſt, ex quo noſtra auget corpora; Et eum panem qui eſt a creatura ſuum corpus confirmans, ex quo noſtra auget corpora. Quando ergo & mixtus calix, & fractus panis percipit verbum Dei fit Euchariſtia ſanguinis & corporis Chriſti, *ex quibus augetur & conſiſtit carnis noſtræ ſubſtantia.* Quomodo dicarnem negabunt eſſe capacem donationis Dei qui eſt vita æterna, quæ ſanguine & corpore Chriſti *nutritur*; Iren. l. 5. c. 2. *Ed. Coloniæ* 1625.

[d] Sacramenta, quæ ſumimus corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti, divina res eſt propter quod & per eadem divinæ conſortes efficimur naturæ; & tamen eſſe non deſinit ſubſtantia vel natura panis & vini. *Gelaſ.* contra *Eutychen.*

ἐδὲις ἂν εἰπεῖν δύναται μὴν ἔχ ων ὅς ἡ αὐτὴ φύσις φλαφητὸ καὶ ἀψηλαφήτε, καὶ ὁρατὸ καὶ ἀοράτε, ὅπως καὶ τὸ σῶμα τῆς πεσῦν λαμβανόμενον σῶμα χριςε, καὶ τὸ ἀειδὲς ἐσῶ ἐκ ὐσίας ἐκ ὄψεως N.B καὶ τοιαῦτ ἄλλ εἰρεῖν πάνυ ἔχεσι. Ephrem. apud Phot. Bib. Cod. 229.

[e] Auguſt. in pars 58. Decr. diſt. 2. conſecr. Can. de Hæc.

[f] Quando

f Quando Dominus corpus suum panem vocat de mul[illegible]rum granorum adunatione congestum, & quando sanguinem suum [illegible] appellat de botris atq; acinis plurimis expressum & in unum coactum gregem nostrum significat commixtione adunatæ multitudinis copulatum, *Cyprian. Ep.* 76. § 4. p. 247.

First, That when the *Encratitæ* held it unlawful to drink Wine, the Fathers did confute them by this very Argument, That Christ himself drank Wine, and did appoint it to be received in the Sacrament. *Wherefore did he not drink Water after his Resurrection but Wine*, saith Chrysostom, *that he might pull up by the Roots another wicked Heresie: for, because there are some who in the Mysteries use Water, declaring, that when he delivered the Mysteries, he delivered Wine; and that when he rose and spread a Common Table without the Mysteries, he used Wine*, he saith, *I will not drink of the fruit of the Vine. Now the Vine produceth Wine, not Water.* Chrysost. Hom. in Mattheum 12. p. 511. l. 12. Edit Eton. g *Be ye sure* (saith Clemens to the Encratitæ) *he also did drink Wine, for he blessed Wine when he said*, take, drink, this is my Blood, *the Blood of the Vine; but that the thing which had been Blessed was Wine, he shewed again, saying to his Disciples*, I will not drink of the fruit of this Vine, till I drink it new with you in my Fathers Kingdom. h Now had not the Sacramental Cup been truly Wine, this Argument would have been frivolous and vain. Had not they held as the Church of *England*, their answer must have been a contradiction to the Doctrine of the Church of Christ.

g εὐ γὰρ ἔστε μετόλαβεν οἶνον καὶ γὰρ ἀνθρώπος καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ εὐλόγησεν γε τὸν οἶνον εἰπὼν λάβετε πίετε τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ ἀμπέλου ὅτι δὲ οἶνος ἦν τὸ εὐλογηθὲν ἀπέδειξε πάλιν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγων οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ταύτης, Clem. Alex. Pædag. l. 2. c. 2. p. 158. B. Ed. Paris. 1641.

Secondly

Secondly. The *Manichees* to prove the contradiction betwixt the Gospel and the Law opposed to that saying of our Saviour, that *none was able to cause the Soul to perish*, that of *Moses*, *that the Blood was the Soul*. To this St. *Austin* answers, *those words may be expounded thus, the Blood is, that is, it signifies the Soul*: this he confirms by this general assertion, that *almost all the Sacraments of those Scriptures are full of signs and figures of the future Preaching, which is now declared by Christ*: and I am apt to think they were such signs and figures as were not properly converted into what they signified. Secondly, this he illustrates by a double instance. † *So is Blood the Soul, as the Rock was Christ, they drank of the spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ, he said not the Rock signified Christ, but the Rock was Christ. 2: I may expound it thus,* saith he, * *Blood is the Soul, that is, it signifies the Soul, because our Saviour did not doubt to say this is my body, when he gave the sign of his body*, since then as the Rock is Christ, and as the signs and figures of the Old Testament are what th Typified in the New, so is the Bread Christs Bo It is wonderfully evident that in St. *Austin's* Judgment it is Christs Body, not by conversion into Christs real Body, but by signification of it:

b Illud quod lex dicit quia sanguis est anima esse positum dicimus sicut alia multa, & pænè omnia Scripturarum illarum Sacramenta signis & figuris N. B. plena sunt sanctæ prædicationis, quæ jam per Dominicum Jesu declarata est. *Contr. Adiman. Cap.* 12.

Sic est enim sanguis anima quomodo Petra erat Christus, sicut dicit Apostolus bibebant enim de spirituali sequente eos Petrâ, Petra autem erat Christus. Notum est autem filios *Israel* Petrâ percussâ bibisse aquam in eremo, de quibus loquebatur Apostolus cum hæc diceret, nec tamen ait Petra significabat Christum, sed ait Petra erat Christus, quæ rursus ne Carnaliter acciperetur, spiritualem illam vocat. *Ib. Cap.* 12.

k Nam ex eo quod scriptum est sanguinem pecoris animam ejus esse possum interpretari præceptum illud in signo esse positum, non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret sui corporis. *Ib.*

yea by such signification as excludes Christs body from being corporally present under the accidents of Bread; for, else the *Manichees* might have replyed upon St. *Austin*, and given him the baffle thus, *as the sign not only signified Christs real Body, but contained it too, so must the Blood not only signifie, but really contain the Soul*: Therefore it is apparent that in St. *Austin*'s time the words of Christ were so interpreted by the *Orthodox* as to exclude Transubstantiation; and to confirm the exposition of the Protestants. Thirdly, The *Nestorians* and *Eutichians* asserted that Christs humane nature was absorpt and changed into the Deity, this some of them affirmed to be done after his Resurrection and Ascension only, but others that it was thus changed at his Conception, whence they affirm, that whilst he lived on Earth, he had the form and shape of man, but not his proper nature. For Illustration and Confirmation of these Heresies, they urge † *the Doctrine of Transubstantiation*, and had the Bread and Wine by Consecration lost their natures, had they been really changed into Christs Flesh and Blood, no greater Confirmation of their Heresie, no fitter illustration of their Tenet could be well imagined. for thus the similitude would run.

† ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις τὴν μεταβολὴν ἀναγκαίαν εἶναι νομίζουσιν, ἵνα τὰ μὲν γενόμενα σῶμα καὶ αἷμα πιστεύωσιν, ἐν δὲ τῷ θείῳ βαπτίσματι ταὐτὸν τοῦτο οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἡγοῦνται, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὕδωρ ἐᾶν ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἄνθρωπον, ἐπὶ τούτων ἐλέγχομεν αὐτῶν τὴν ἀσέβειαν. EPA. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις τὴν μεταβολὴν ἀναγκαίαν εἶναι νομίζουσιν, ἵνα τὰ μὲν γενόμενα σῶμα καὶ αἷμα πιστεύωσιν, ἐν δὲ τῷ θείῳ βαπτίσματι ταὐτὸν τοῦτο οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἡγοῦνται, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὕδωρ ἐᾶν ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἄνθρωπον, ἐπὶ τούτων ἐλέγχομεν αὐτῶν τὴν ἀσέβειαν. Διανοητὸν σῶμα μὴ ἔχοντα ἀνθρωπίνην οὐκ οἶδα μεταβολὴν ἢ θείαν, Theodoret. To. 4. Dial. 2. p. 84, 85.

First, That as in the Eucharist there is only the outward shape and form of Bread, and not the real substance; even so, in Christ there was the shape and form of Flesh, but not the very nature.

Secondly, Even as in the Eucharist, the essential form and material substance of Bread and Wine are swallowed up and converted into the Body and blood of Christ; so likewise after Christs ascension, the humane nature is absorpt, and converted into the Deity. What is it therefore that the *Fathers* answer, do they confess the thing, and say *Transubstantiation* was the Tradition of the Church, and was the Doctrine of the Scriptures, but that no like Tradition, nor evidence from Scripture can be produced in favour of the Doctrine of the *Eutichians* and *Nestorians*; which is the only thing that can be answered by men of *T.G*'s. principles? No, they expresly say, and that in words as plain, & full, as any Protestant could use, that this similitude doth overthrow the Doctrine it was brought to justifie; * *Because the Bread and Wine, though after consecration they become signs and Images of Christs true body and his blood, yet*

l Certe imago & similitudo corporis & sanguinis Christi in actione Mysteriorum celebrantur, satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur hoc nobis in ipso Christo Domino sentiendum quod in ejus imagine profitemur, celebramus, & sumus. Ut sicut in hance, scilicet in divinam transeant (Sacramenta) Sancto Spiritu perficiente substantiam, permanentes tamen in suæ proprietate naturæ, sic illud ipsum mysterium principale cujus nobis efficientiam virtutemque veraciter representant, Gelasius de duabus naturis in Christo contra Eutich:-sicut enim panis divinâ illum Sanctificante Gratiâ liberatus est quidem ab appellatione panis dignus autem habitus est dominici corporis appellatione etiam si natura panis in ipso permansit, & non duo corpora sed unum filii corpus predicatur, sic & hic divinâ naturâ in corpore, insidente (Gr. ἐνιδρύσεως Mss. Exemp. Bibl. Florent.) Chrysost. ad Cæsarium Monachum. τὰ ὁρώμενα σύμβολα τῇ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορίᾳ τετίμηκεν, οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλὼν ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προστεθεικώς. Theod. Dial. 1. p. 38.

they abide in their proper substance, and still retain the nature of Bread and Wine, and that the change is wrought upon them, not by destruction of their natures, but by addition of grace to nature, and so * *the Hereticks* (say they) *are caught in their own Nets.* For then the paralel runs thus, *as the Symbols are called another thing, because Gods grace is added to them, but still retain their proper nature, and the same substance which they had before. Even so Christs humane body, although by reason of its union to the God-head, it may sometimes have those names which signifie the nature and properties of God ascribed to it; yet must it continue in its former nature, reality and substance. And as the Bread and Wine are not converted into Christs real body by reason of the grace annexed to them, but do retain their former natures: so neither is Christs body changed into the Deity by reason of its union with it, but still retains its former substance, nature and proprieties.*

* ἀλωσεῖς ὕφη αἱ ἀρκυῶν Theodoret 2 p. 84. 85.

Having thus shewed the judgment of the ancient Fathers, we now proceed to the consideration of those Testimonies which *T. G.* citeth from them to evince the contrary. And here we have just reason to complain, that nothing is produced which is not answered in *Morton*, *Down*, in Bishop *Taylor*, *White*, and all our modern Writers on this subject: and that if we lay aside his spurious Authors, and his false citations, we have but little left to answer. And

P. 192. First, That the passages of St. *Ambrose de Sacramentis* are supposititious, is proved already by *Albertinus de Sacramento*. Euch. p. 507. So is that book *de Cœna Domini*, which bears the nam of

Cy-

Cyprian by the confeſſion of the [m] *Roman* Doctors: the ſame we have juſt reaſon to aſſert of *Cyril*, (for if we may believe † *Geſner* or *Simler*, ſundry written Copies entitle them to *John Biſhop* of *Hieruſalem*, one, who lived well near Eight hundred years after Chriſt,) and of *Euſebius Emiſſenus*, as is confeſſed by *Bellarmine*, *Baronius*, and by *Antonius* [n] *Poſſevinus*, who having told us the chief reaſon that moved them to the Printing of this Book, was this fifth Homily which *T. G.* cited; he adds *that the ſaid Homily muſt be ſpurious, becauſe it ſpeaks againſt* Pelagius *who flouriſhed in the dayes of* Auſtin; (i.e full Forty years after the death of *Euſebius*) and haply it was upon this account that *T. G.* cites this paſſage, not by the name of *Hom.* 5. *de Paſch.* as in *Euſebius* it is: but as it is in *Hierom*, under the name of *Serm. de Corp. Dom.* that ſo we might not take it for that Homily, which is ſo manifeſtly ſpurious.

[m] Author Sermonis de cœna Domini non eſt Cyprianus ſed aliquis poſterior *Bellarm: l.* 4. *de Euchariſt. c.* 26. Author Sermonis de cœna domini eſt ignotus. Garetius de veritate corporis Chriſti *Fol.* 181. *v. Cochum p.* 79.

*James Baſtardy of the falſe Fathers p.*12. †Biblioth

[n] Quæ vero qui hunclibrum imprimendum cura-vit maxime movit Homil. 5. in pascha ea etiam non poteſt eſſe Euſebii Emiſſeni quia loquitur adverſus Pelagium qui multo poſt tempore fuit *D. Auguſtini ætate: Apparat. To.* 1 *titul, Euſeb. Emiſs. vide Rivet. Crit. Sacr: l.* 3. *c.* 1.

Secondly, were they aſſuredly the works of theſe Renowned Fathers, whoſe names they have uſurped a Title to, by falſe Tranſlations, and by concealing of thoſe words, which make againſt the Doctrine of the *Roman Church*; they, almoſt all of them, are made to ſay the contradictory to what they really affirm. Thus *Tertullian* is ſuborned to ſay, that [o] *our Lord having taken Bread, made it his own Body, by ſaying, this is my*

[o] Acceptum panem & diſtributum Diſcipulis corpus illum ſuum fecit dicendo hoc eſt corpus meum (*ſo far T. G.*

then follows) id eſt, figura corporis mei. Figura autem non fuiſſet niſi veritatis eſſet corpus. Cæterum vacua res, quod eſt phantaſma figuram capere non poſſet. Cur autem panem corpus ſuum appellat & non magis Peponem quem Marcion cordis loco habuit? non intelli-

gens veterem fuiſſe iſtam figuram corporis Chriſti dicentis per Hieremiam, adverſus me cogitaverunt cogitatum, dicentes, venite, conjiciamus lignum in panem ejus, ſcilicet crucem in corpus ejus. *Adverſ. Marcionem. l.* 4. *Cap.* 40. *vid. etiam. l.* 3. *c.* 19.

Body: but theſe words muſt be concealed, *that is, it is a figure of my Body*; *whereas it could have been no figure of Chriſts body, unleſs that body had been real*: and thoſe that preſently enſue muſt not be mentioned, viz. *Bread was an ancient figure of Chriſts body, it being ſaid by* Jeremy, *come let us put wood into his Bread* (i. e.) *the Croſs into his body.*

Moreover it is told us that St. *Ambroſe* ſaith, *that when the Conſecration is performed, the Bread is made the Fleſh of Chriſt — he ſpake the word and it was made*; but then we muſt not know the words that do immediatly follow, to inform us that it is ſo made Fleſh, as we are made new Creatures, and that that change is a like inſtance of the power of God; the words are theſe, [b] *Thou thy ſelf was't an old Creature, but after Conſecration thou begin'ſt to be a new: ſee then after what manner Chriſts words do at his pleaſure change all Creatures, and alter natures Inſtitutions.* Agreeably to this St. [a] *Auſtin* ſaith, that we are made not only Chriſtians, *but even Chriſt himſelf.* And [b] Leo *that the body of the Regenerate* (*hic caro Crucifixi*) *is made the Fleſh of the Crucified.* And [c] *Chryſoſtom* that *after Baptiſm of men we are made Angels*; and [d] Paulinus, *that we are made the blood of Chriſt.* From all which paſſages we have juſt reaſon to conclude with *Cyril*, ἡ γένεσις

[b] Mandavit & creatum eſt. Tu ipſe eras vetus creatura, poſtea quam conſecratus es nova creatura eſſe cepiſti accipe ergo quemadmodum ſermo Chriſti creaturam omnem mutare conſuevit, & mutat quando vult inſtituta naturæ. *Ambroſ. de Sacram. l.* 4 *c.* 4.

[a] Non ſolum nos Chriſtianos factos eſſe ſed Chriſtum in *Joh. Tract.* 21.

[b] De paſs. Serm. 14.

[c] οὐ τὸ φώτισμα ἄγγελοι ἐστὶ ἀνθρώπων γενέσθαι. in *Act Hom.* 23.

[d] Epiſt. 25.

ἐκ πάντως

ὃ πάντως φύσεως σημαίνει μεταβολὴν, *that to be made doth not continually import a change of nature*; and therefore that this paſſage of St. *Ambroſe* cannot with any certainty be thus interpreted.

Secondly, we muſt not know what follows in that very Chapter to explain theſe words, and to confute the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, viz. [p] *if there be ſo great force in Chriſts words, that by it things begin to be, that which before they were not; how much more operative muſt it be, to cauſe, that things be what they were, and yet be changed into another.* Which words are extant thus in all the Ancient Maniſcripts and old Editions of St. *Ambroſe*, and are thus cited by *Guitmund*, *Yvo*, *Algerus*, *Gratian*, and *Anſelm*, and in the old Editions of *Lanfrancus*, though in the late Editions of St. *Ambroſe* they are corrupted; and to abet this fraud, *Lanfrancus* in a new Edition is produced affirming that ſome Copies did admit a diverſe lection. We muſt not know what alſo here he doth affirm, *That* [q] *as we do receive* (in Baptiſm) *the likeneſs of his death, ſo* (in the holy Sacrament) *do we receive the likeneſs of his pretious blood.*

p Si tanta vis in Sermone Domini Jeſu ut inciperent eſſe quæ non erant, quanto magis operatorius eſt ut ſint quæ erant, N. B. & in aliud commutentur, *ibid.*

q Sed forte dicis ſpeciem ſanguinis non video. Sed habet ſimilitudinem, ſicut enim ſimilitudinem mortis ſumpſiſti, ita etiam ſimilitudinem pretioſi ſanguinis bibis, ut nullus horror cruoris ſit, & pretium tamen operetur redemptionis, *ibid.*

Again we muſt be told St. *Ambroſe* ſaith, *That as our Lord Jeſus Chriſt is the true Son of God, not as men are by Grace, but as the Son of the ſubſtance of his Father; ſo it is his very true Fleſh, as him-* * *T. G. p. 305, de Sacram. l. 6: c: 1.*

him ſelf hath ſaid which we receive, and his very true Blood, which we drink. But then we muſt not know what follows to explain this paſſage and to confirm our Doctrine, *viz.* That [r] *we receive this Sacrament in a Similitude, but truly do obtain the grace and the vertue of the nature*: whence it is evident, that it is therefore ſaid to be Chriſts very Fleſh and Blood, becauſe it doth convey the vertue of them; which is more evident from that which follows, to wit, that [s] *our Lord Chriſt being partaker of the Divinity and humane nature, thou who receiveſt Bread, doſt in that nourriſhment partake of his Divinity.* And let it be obſerved that *Ambroſe* doth indeed affirm, that as Chriſt ſaid, that which we receive is truly Fleſh, and is true drink, but he doth not affirm that we receive it truly and ſubſtantially; and as when Chriſt declared, that unleſs we eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, &c. That Fleſh & drink he ſpake of, was true Fleſh and drink; but the receiving, the eating, and the drinking of it, was Metaphorical; ſo may it be here: and hence * *Fulgentius* and others tells us, that we do eat it in our Baptiſme, and therefore as we are ſaid to eat it there, ſo alſo, may we be conceived to eat it in the other Sacrament.

[r] In ſimilitudinem quidem accipis Sacramentum, ſed vere naturæ gratiam virtutemque conſequeris. *de Sacr. l. 1, c. 6.*

[s] Quomodo diſcendit panis vivus de Cælo. Reſp quia idem Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus conſors eſt & divinitatis & corporis & tu quia accipis Panem *N. B.* Divinæ ejus ſubſtantiæ in illo participaris alimento. *ibid.*

* De Baptiſmo Æthiopum *c. ult. Cyril. Glaphyr. in Exod. l. 2.*

Laſtly we muſt be told, how the ſame *Ambroſe* doth aſſert, that *the Word of Chriſt, which of nothing could make that to be, which was not, can change thoſe things which are, into that which before they were not*; And yet that this mutation was not a change of nature, but of ſignification, and of the vertue of the Sacrament, is evident from

from that vvhich followvs in this Chapter, *viz.* That **it is not Corporal meat, but Spiritual*, and that *before the benediction it is named another kind, but after Consecration it ſignifies Christs body*; or that elſevvhere he tells us, that *the power of God ſo operates to change them, as that they ſtill continue what they were before.* Nay this is alſo evident from the vvords cited by *T. G* viz. *That word of Chriſt, which of nothing could make that to be which was not, can it not change thoſe things which are, into thoſe things which they were not; For it is not a leſs matter to give new natures to things, than to change their natures?* vvhere evident it is, that this nevv nature given to the Sacramental Elements is oppoſed to *the mutation of their nature*; and therefore it is evident, that in the judgment of St. *Ambroſe* this change was made not by mutation of the nature of Bread and Wine, but by addition of a new nature to them, (*i. e.*) by the addition of new qualities and vertues, in which familiar acceptation of the word St. *Peter* tells us, that by the promiſes of Chriſt *we are all made partakers of the diuine nature.* And the Fathers frequently affirm that *by faith, and by the holy ſpirit we are changed into another nature*, and that after the Reſurrection we ſhall thus be changed. Of this kind * *Albertinus* hath collected above Thirty inſtances.

T. G. p. 304. Non corporalis eſus ſed ſpiritualis eſt. ante benedictionem verborum cæleſtium alia ſpecies nominatur poſt conſecrationem corpus Chriſti ſignificatur. c. 9. de his qui initiantur.

* De Sacr. Euch. l. 2. p. 489. 504.

Ob. The change which is made in the nature of Bread, *is here illuſtrated by the examples of thoſe miraculous changes, which were wrought by holy men of old in the natures of things, as of* Moſes *his Rod being turned into a Serpent the waters of* Egypt *into Blood*, &c. Anſw. But this &c. conceals three inſtances produced by *Ambroſe*, which only

T. G. p. 304.

only ſignifie an accidental change, viz. [t] *The ſweetning of the waters of* Marah, *the ſwimming of the Iron, and the returning of the waters of the River* Jordan. Whence it is evident that all the inſtances produced leave it uncertain, whether St. *Ambroſe* did intend a proper change of ſubſtance, or only a change of qualities and vertues. Secondly, had *Ambroſe* only given inſtances of a ſubſtantial change, it would not hence have followed that he did intend to prove the Sacramental Symbols were ſo changed, but only a *majori*, to prove that he who was the Author of ſuch ſubſtantial mutations could certainly effect that change, which was but accidental: Thus from the ſubſtantial converſion of water into Wine, he proves, [u] *we ought to think that God can change our mortal into a glorious and immortal body*, which change is only accidental, and from [x] *the ſupernatural production of our Lord by vertue of the holy Ghoſt*, he in this very Chapter proves, *we muſt not doubt but the ſame Spirit can Regenerate the Baptized perſon.* So that we ſee it is familiar with him to prove the poſſibility of accidental changes, by examples of a change ſubſtantial.

[t] Jordanus retrorſum converſus contra naturam in ſui fontis revertitur exordium nonne claret naturam vel maritinorum fluctuum vel fluvialis curſus eſſe mutatam? Marath fluvius amariſſimus erat ut ſitiens populus bibere non poſſet. Mittit Moſes lignum in aquam, & amaritudinem ſuam aquarum naturam depoſuit, quam infuſa ſubito gratia temperavit. Sub Hæliſeo prophetæ, uni ex filiis prophetarum excuſſum eſt ferrum de ſecuri, & ſtatim merſum eſt. Rogavit Heliſæum qui amiſerit ferrum, miſit etiam Heliſæus lignum in aquam, & ferrum natavit, utique & hoc præter naturam factum eſſe cognoſcimus. *cap.* 9. *de his qui initiantur.*

[u] Credendum jam eſt, ex hoc mortalem hominem in immortalitatem poſſe converti, quando vilis ſubſtantia in pretioſam converſa eſt ſubſtantiam. *Serm.* 19.

[x] Si ergo inquit, ſuperveniens Spiritus Sanctus in virginem, conceptionem operatus eſt & generationis munus implevit non utique dubitandum eſt quod ſuperveniens in fontem, vel ſuper eum qui Baptiſmum conſequitur, veritatem regenerationis cooperetur. *cap.* 9. *de his qui initiantur:*

Ob.

Ob. St. *Ambrose* saith, *the Symbols are not what nature formed them, but what the Benediction consecrated them.* Answ. True, because they are not only so, but by this more excellent and Spiritual change, obtain a name which is more excellent, denominations being taken from the better. Thus *Chrysostom* affirms, *That such is the power of Baptism, that it doth not suffer men to be still Men.* And *Leo*, That *the Baptized person is not the same before and after Baptism.* And *Epiphanius*, That *when we are endowed with Temperance, the Flesh is no more Flesh.* Whence yet it were ridiculous to argue, that either Baptism or Temperance essentially change either the flesh or nature of a Christian.

a ὄντως μεγάλη τοῦ Βαπτίσματος δύναμις οὐκ ἀφίησιν ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ἀνθρώπους, in Act. Hom. 23.
b De Pass. Dom. Ser. 14.
c κἂν κτήσεται ἐγκράτειαν ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ἔτι σὰρξ ἔστιν Hæres. 66.

Ob. He affirms further, That *by this Benediction nature is changed.* Answ. True, but then that word, not only in the Authors before mentioned, but in St. [d] *Ambrose*, doth very often signifie only a change of quality and virtue: For he affirms, *That* Thecla *changed the nature of the Beasts that were designed to devour her, and that the Beasts themselves had changed their nature* (i e.) their fierceness and rapacity; and in this very place he saith, *That the Nature of the water of the River Jordan was clearly changed, because that it was driven back.*

d De Virg. l. 2. Hæxamer. l. 3. c. 2.

We must be told that *Chrysostom* doth say, *that things that lye before us are not the works of humane power, we only hold the the place of Ministers, but he that Sanctifieth and changeth them is Christ.* But then we must not know, that in this very Homily the Consecrated Elements are stiled *the Symbols of Christs Body*; and that disputing against *Marcian* and *Valentinian*, who held Christ had no real Body; he confutes and stops their mouth by saying,

T. G. p. 303.

In Mat. Hom. 82. p. 510. l. 36

ing, *That in the Bleſſed Sacrament we have the Symbol of that Body.* Whereas, could he have truly ſaid, we have their real Fleſh and Blood, he had then ſpoken what would have more effectually confuted their abſurd poſition.

P. 511. l. 10, 25. 2. We muſt not know that in that very place he confutes the Hereſie of the *Encratitæ*, by ſhewing, *That when our Lord delivered the Myſteries, he delivered the Wine*, and that after his Reſurrection he drank Wine to verifie this ſaying, *I will no more drink of the Fruit of the Vine, till I drink it new with you in my Fathers Kingdom.*

P. 514. l. 28. Nor Thirdly, That Chriſt in thoſe Holy Myſteries *doth give himſelf unto the Faithful, but to none other.* But had we no ſuch indications of the mind of *Chryſoſtom*, the words themſelves are very inſignificative and unconcluding; for that which *Chryſoſtom* affirmeth of the *Euchariſt, that theſe things are not the works of humane power*, we Proteſtants acknowledge, as knowing that it is no work of humane power to cauſe the virtue of the Holy Spirit to attend theſe Myſteries, and to make that to be food of the Soul, which naturally can only feed the Body. He that thus Sanctifies and changeth theſe material Symbols muſt be God. And hence St. *Chryſoſtom* informs us the caſe is juſt the ſame in Baptiſm, *That it is not an Angel who there moves the Water, but that it is the Lord of Angels* ὁ τῶν ἀγγέλων δεσπότης, *who works all things there. That man doth nothing* ἀλλ' ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμις ἐργάζεται ταῦτα, *but that it is the power of God that worketh all things.* And whereas he adds, *that it is he who Sanctifies theſe things and changeth them.* St. *Cyril* doth inform us, *that whatſoever the Holy Spirit toucheth is Sanctified and Changed.* St. *Clemens*,

Hom. 35. in Joh

In 1 ad Cor. Hom. 8.

Catech. Myſtag. 5.

*Clemens, *That the Devil doth μεταποιεῖν τὰς γυναῖκας εἰς πόρνας, (i. e.) transmute Women into Whores.* Nyſſenus, *that Regeneration, εἰς υἱὸς φωτὸς καὶ υἱὸς ἡμέρας μεταποιεῖται. (i. e.) doth change us into the Sons of Light, and of the day.* And *Chryſoſtom* himſelf informs us, *That to make the barren Womb to bear, is an example of this Tranſmutation.* Such therefore we may rationally conceive that change to be of which St. *Chryſoſtom* here ſpeaketh.

* Pædag. l. 3. c. 2. In Cant. Hom. 4. In Gen. Hom. 42. vid Albert de Sacr. Euch. l. 2. p. 545.

Gaudentius muſt tell us, *That the Maker and Lord of natures, who produceth Bread out of the Earth, doth again of Bread,* (becauſe he can and hath promiſed to do it) *make his own Body, and he who made Water of Wine, maketh of Wine his own Blood.* But then we muſt not know, that in the ſame place he aſſerts, *That when our Saviour ſaid,* This is my Body, *he gave to his Diſciples Conſecrated Bread and Wine*: Or that *becauſe our Saviour in the Goſpel ſaith, I am the true Vine, he did ſufficiently declare, that all the Wine he offered in the figure of his Paſſion was his Blood*; or that *we eat his Fleſh, when we receive his Doctrine*: which doth ſufficiently confute the Roman Doctrine, and ſhew the change of which *Gaudentius* ſpeaks, to be Spiritual and Myſtical. For if the Conſecrated Signs be Bread and Wine, they are not properly Chriſts Body, if what is offered be a Figure of his Paſſion, it is not the Truth: For as *Gaudentius* there telleth us, *figura non eſt veritas, ſed imitatio veritatis,* (i. e.) *a figure is the imitation of the truth, but not the truth.* Wherefore *Gaudentius* doth argue *a majori*, thus, he that made Water to be ſubſtantially Wine, can certainly make Wine to become Sacramentally his Blood.

T. G. P. 306.

Tract. in Ex. 2.

We muſt be told that St. *Ignatius* confeſſeth the

T. G. P. 507.

Eucharist to be the Flesh of Christ which suffered for our Sins. But then we must not know, that this Epistle is intended against the *Simonians* and *Menandrians*, who held, that Christ suffered only in appearance, & had no real Flesh, & therefore could not confess that the Eucharist was Sacramentally Christs flesh, least admitting the figure, they should be forced to admit the truth and substance; and therefore his *Interpolater* disputes against them thus, *That incorporeal things have neither shape nor character, nor figure of a Living Creature that hath form which may be seen, whereas, when Christ shall come to Judgment, they who have pierced shall see him.* Secondly, We confess the Eucharist to be Christs Body and his Flesh; and only do dispute the manner how, of which *Ignatius* saith nothing. We do acknowledge that it is truly and indeed Christs flesh and Blood, as knowing that it may be truly, what it is Spiritually: for Christ is the true Vine, and the true Light; Heaven is called the true Tabernacle, and Spiritual Blessings, the true Riches; and of this we have innumerable instances both from the Fathers and the Church of *Rome*, produced by *Albertinus de Sacramento Euch.* p. 218. 854.

ἄλλοι δὲ τινες λέγουσι τὸ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν πεπονθέναι. p. 2.

V. Usher Not. in Epist. ad Smyr. p. 50

Joh. 15. 1. *Joh.* 1. 8. *Heb.* 8. 2. *Luk.* 16. 12

T. G. p. 306. *Orat. Mag. Catec.* c. 37

Moreover it is objected, that *Gregorius Nyssen* doth affirm, *That he believes* τὴν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἁγιαζόμενον τροφὴν εἰς σῶμα τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου μεταποιεῖσθαι, (i. e.) *The Bread Sanctified by the Word of God to be transmuted into the body of the word.* *Answ.* True, but then it is as true, that this transmutation may be as well by the addition of Grace to Nature, as by the substantial mutation of that nature, it being evident from the abundant testimonies of *Basil*, *Nazianzen*, *Chrysostom*, and *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, and other Fathers, that μεταποιεῖσθαι, and *transmutari*, are terms

Vid. Alb. de Sacr. Euch. l. 2. p. 487.

terms indifferently used as well of a mutation, which only doth respect the qualities, States and conditions of the Subject, as the nature of it; and of this we have many instances in the undoubted works of *Gregory*: Who tells us, That *the Soul made virtuous*, is [a] μεταποιηθεῖσα, transmuted, and that [b] *Regeneration is a transmutation of it into that which is Divine*; and that [c] *when we appear in Glory, we shall undergo this transmutation*: nay, in this very place he twice asserts, *That the mortal Body of Christ being received into our body, doth change our body into its self*, or its own nature. So then, these words cannot infer, That the Sacramental Bread and Wine receive by Consecration any other change.

a In Inscr Psal. c. 8.
b πρὸς τὸ θεῖον μεταποίησις in Cant. Hom 8.
c ibid. Hom. 9.
d τὸ θανατιθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σῶμα ἐν τῷ ἡμετέρῳ γινόμενον ὅλον πρὸς ἑαυτὸ μεταποιεῖ καὶ μετατίθησι -- τὸ ἀθάνατον σῶμα ἐν τῷ ἀναλαβόντι αὐτὸ γενόμενον πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φύσιν καὶ τὸ πᾶν μεταποίησεν, ibid.

He tells us further, that the virtue of the benediction doth μετασοικειοῦσθαι τῶν φαινομένων τὴν φύσιν, *change or transelement the nature of things which do appear*. *Answ.* This word is also used ordinarily, to signifie not any change of substance, but of qualities and virtues only: and of this kind you have in *Albertinus* many instances produced, of which no less then twenty are cited from *Gregorius Nyssen*, declaring, that by Regeneration and Baptism we are transelemented or changed to a Spiritual Nature; and that the Resurrection will thus transelement and change our Natures; So that it may with equal reason be concluded from this word, that in Baptism our Natures are Transubstantiated, as that the nature of the Eucharistical Bread is changed into Christs real and substantial body. And so much for that spurious or doubtful passage of *Gregorius Nyssen*.

l. 2. p. 488

T. G. p. 306. The passage cited from St. *Cyril* saith, *That our Saviour sometime changed Water into Wine, and shall we not think him worthy of our belief that he changed Wine into his Blood.* But then the Catech. 2. same St. *Cyril* doth also say, *he who raised* Lazarus *when four dayes dead, can he not much more easily raise thee,* (viz. from a death of Sin unto a life of Righteousness) *who dost live and breath?* Catech. 4. And again, *the rod of Moses was changed by the will of God into the dissentaneous nature of a Serpent, and shall not dead Man be restored unto himself again?* And both St. *Ambr* se and St. [t] *Austin* do argue from the conversion of Water into Wine, That God can change our mortal into immortal Glorious bodies. If then it be ridiculous from any of these passages to argue a substantial change wrought in us by Regeneration, or the Resurrection, it must be also vain to argue a substantial change from the like instance, used to illustrate the change, which is by Consecration made upon the Eucharistick Symbols. (2) The words immediately preceding do clearly evidence, that *Cyril* argues *a majori:* For saith he, *If God could make this change from Water into Wine* ὃ πολλῷ μᾶλλον, *shall it not much more be confessed that he doth give us the fruition of his Body and his Blood:* whereas had he conceived the mutation of the Eucharistick Symbols to have been equal to the change of Water into Wine, that phrase had been improper and absurd; for of two equal changes it cannot reasonably be affirmed, he that is able to perform the one, is much more able to perform the other. (3) I have already largely proved, that *Cyril* here intended only an accidental change, and shall yet further make it evident from two considerations. 1. That in the following Catechism he

[t] Serm. 12. ex 40 a Sirmundo editis. Catech. 4. Myst.

speaks

speaks thus, *we pray unto the God of Mercies, that he would send his Spirit into the things that lye before us, and would make the Bread the Body of Christ, and the Wine his Blood: For whatsoever the Holy Spirit toucheth is sanctified and changed:* not that it is substantially changed; for he affirmeth of the *Baptismal Oyl and Water*, that *they are Sanctified by the Holy Spirit*: And yet no Romanist will hence infer, that they do not retain the nature both of Oyl and Water. 2. In his first Catechism he affirms, that as the Eucharistick Bread and Wine before the Consecration, remains meer Bread and Wine, but afterwards is made the Body and Blood of Christ, ἐν αὐτὸν ὀγρόπον. *After like manner truly are the meats used in the Pomps of Satan, in themselves* (pure or) *simple, but by invocation of the Dæmons, they are made impure.* As therefore the mutation of these meats, is only a mutation of their qualities, not of the substance of them: so must the change of Bread and Wine, with which it is compared and equalled, be supposed to be. In fine, to set before us the danger of not believing Christ more then our sences; and to make others know it as well as *Roman Catholicks*, he promiseth to set before them the words of *Epiphanius*, viz. *We see the Sacrament is neither equal nor like unto the fleshly Image, or the invisible Deity, or the Characters of his Members; for this is of a round form, and insensible according to power. And yet because he was pleased to say, through Grace,* This is my Body, *every one believeth his saying, For, who believeth not that it is his very true Body, falleth from Grace and Salvation.* Answ. by this Translation of the words of *Epiphanius*, we are like to see, and others to know, nothing but the detestable fraud and falshood of *T. G.* For

* παρακαλῶμεν τὸν φιλάνθρωπον θεὸν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐξαποστεῖλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα. ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα χριστοῦ τὸν δὲ οἶνον αἷμα χριστοῦ πάντως γὰρ οὗ ἐὰν ἐφάψαιτο τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τοῦτο ἡγίασται καὶ μεταβεβλήται.

* Catech.

P. 293.

Epiphanius doth not say as *T. G.* translates him, *That who believeth not that it is his very true Body, falleth from Grace*: But his words are these,[a] *He that believeth not that Christ is true, doth fall from Grace.* Now he that differs from another Church or Person in exposition of Christs words may yet believe, that Christ is true in all his sayings, as much as they from whom he differs. Secondly had he considered well the context, he would have found this passage is a strong argument against him: For *Epiphanius* in this very Section, affirmeth Man to be like God, τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα ἀλλὰ οὐ κατὰ φύσιν, (i.e.) *in a similitude or figure*, but not according to nature; for, saith he, men have not the Image of God κατὰ ἰσότητα, or equally; *and yet what God hath constituted we will not substract,* **for he is true, who by his Grace hath given to man to be like unto him, and we have many like examples*; and then immediately follows the example of the Eucharist. Now the force of *Epiphanius* his argument consisting in this, That we are like unto God after his Image, but yet not according to nature, even as the Sacramental Bread is like the Body of Christ, it is plain, that the Sacramental Symbols are the Body of Christ and his Blood, κατ' εἰκόνα ἀλλὰ οὐ κατὰ φύσιν, according to the Image or representment, not according to nature. Thirdly, St. *Epiphanius* affirms, that Christ pronounced of Bread and Wine, *this is mine*, his words are these, ἔλαβε τάδε ipsum panem. *Petav.* καὶ εὐχαριστήσας εἶπε τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τόδε. Now since that τάδε, or the things Christ took and blessed, confessedly were Bread and Wine; the τόδε which doth answer to them must be so. I might have added many other answers produced from these Fathers, but I have chosen only to answer what the

[a] ὁ γὰρ μὴ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν ἀληθινὸν, ὡς εἶπεν, ἐκπίπτει τῆς χάριτος. *Epiphanius Anch.* p. 60

* ἀληθὴς δὲ ἔστιν ὁ μετὰ χάριτος τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δωρησάμενος καὶ ὅσα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τῶν ὁμοίων, ib.

the very places did ſuggeſt, that ſo the Reader might perceive that *T. G.* either never read the places cited, or elſe did chuſe to cite them, though he ſaw they held the contrary to that Doctrine for which he doth produce them: and to convince the Reader, that the Judgment of the Fathers muſt be clearly for us, ſeeing the ſtrongeſt paſſages the Romaniſts cite againſt us do confirm our Doctrine.

We have now done with his Fathers, and briefly ſhall conſider what he hath to ſay from Proteſtants.

And thus he begins, *That Tranſubſtantiation was a Doctrine received in the Univerſal Church from the time of* Berengarius, *that is 600 years ago, is ſcarcely denied by any I know of.* Anſw. One of the Proteſtants you cite will be ſufficient to help your ignorance, I mean the *Reverend Biſhop Morton*, in the Treatiſe of the Maſs, Where we have this confeſſion of *Peter Lumbard*, Maſter of the Sentences, *whether the converſion be ſubſtantial or not, I am not able to determine.* And *Scotus* affirming, *that the Article of Tranſubſtantiation was no Doctrine of Faith, before the Council of* Lateran. And *Suarez* ſaying, *that ſome School-men held, that Tranſubſtantiation was not very ancient*; *Scotus*, to wit, and *Gabriel Biel* among others. And *Eraſmus*, that it was but lately determined in the Church. And laſtly, *Cardinal Perroon*, (who did not look upon it as an alterius generis, definire non ſufficio. *Lomb. Sent. l. 4. Diſtinct.* 11. *Lit. a.*

P. 299.

Lib. 3. c. 2 §. 3, 4. A.D. 1159

a Si quæratur quālis ſit converſio (viz. panis in Euchariſtia) an formalis, an ſubſtantialis,

b *Scotus* dicit ante conſilium Lateranēnſe non fuiſſe dogma fidei Tranſubſtantiationem. *Bellar. Lib.* 3. de *Euch. cap.* 23. ſ. ſed ramen

c In Synaxi ſerò definivit Eccleſia Tranſubſtantiationem; diù ſatis erat credere ſub pane quocunque modo adeſſe verum Corpus Chriſti. *Eraſm.* in 1. Cor. 7. p. 373.

a thing very commendable to oppugne the received Doctrine of the whole Church of Christ) asserts, That *if it had not been for the Council of* Laterane, *it might be now lawful to oppugne it.* Pious and Learned *Bishop Usher* shews out of ancient and authentick Records, ' That after the ' times of *Berengarius* many continued, even there ' where Satan had his Throne, who privately em- ' ployed both their Tongues and Pens in defence ' of the truth against the Doctrine of Transub- ' stantiation. *Hamelman* and *Chemniitus* are most impertinently cited, for they only do confess, that St. *Ignatius* said what we all grant, & what doth not in the least confirm the Roman Doctrine, as we have already proved. *Perkins* is also falsly and impertinently cited : for he doth not affirm, that this particular Heresie of *Transubstantiation* was spread over the whole world during the space of nine hundred years. Nay, he expresly doth assert, *That it was not concluded in the days of* Lumbard, *nor then received as an Article of Faith, and that for a whole thousand years, the Church of Christ taught Sgiritual Manducation, and that the Ancients did interpret the institution by a figure.* That the *Centuriators* do affirm of *Origen. Cent.* 3. p. 260. and of *Tertullian*, p. 58. that *they speak not commodiously of Transubstantiation*, is a notorious falshood : what the *Centuriators* cite from *Tertullian*, p. 58. is most expresly for the contrary ; and of *Origen*, p. 260. they speak thus, *recte in Cœna Domini sub pane & vino sumi asserit corpus & sanguinem Domini*, (i. e.) Origen *rightly doth assert, that in the Supper of the Lord under the bread and wine, we take the body and blood of Christ.* What they cite out of *Ambrose* Cent. 4. p. 294. is from the Authour, *precationis primæ Præpar. ad Missam*, which is a spurious piece,

Card. Perroon. En. Sa. Harrang. Antiers Estates p. 33 De Christ. Eccles. Succ. is. p. 190 208.

T. G. p. 301.

p. 300.

Problem. p. 155, 156

T. G. p. 301.

piece, as they themſelves have noted from *Eraſmus*. The true *Ambroſius* is reckoned among the Fathers, that maintained *the pure Doctrine in this point*, p. 242. Of *Humphrey* and *Camerarius* I can ſay nothing, becauſe I know not where to ſee them: But we have great reaſon to ſuſpect, that they alſo are cited *more Romano* (i.e.) with great impertinence and falſhood. And I am certainly informed from *Oxford*, that what is cited as from *Urſin*, is really the words of *Urſins Adverſary*. Such ingenuity we meet with in the Citations of the Roman party. *Eraſmus non eſſe Ambroſii cenſuit.*

Having produced theſe Teſtimonies of the Fathers, which I have proved to be impertinent or ſpurious, and theſe confeſſions of the *Proteſtants*, which are inſignificant or falſe, or only ſuch as do aſſert that *Cyprian de Cæna Domini*, *Euſebius*, *Emiſſenus*; and ſuch ſpurious pieces ſeem to ſpeak in favour of this Idle Dream. He thus concludes, that to deny what is confirmed by the Teſtimony of ſo many Ancient Fathers, and ſtrengthned by the confeſſion of our Brethren is moſt unreaſonable. But alas, this flouriſh doth moſt aſſuredly confound the Church of *Rome*, and evidently confutes that Doctrine it was intended to confirm. For Firſt, it is confeſſed by many Doctors of the the Church of *Rome*, that *Tranſubſtantiation is no ancient Doctrine*, viz. *Peter Lombard*, *Scotus*, *Biel*, *Eraſmus* and *Peroon*. And Secondly, *That in the Ptimitive Church it was not any Article of Faith.* Thirdly, [b] *That were it not for the authority and Determination of the Roman Church, the words of Chriſt might more ſimply, plainly and truly be* P. 308, 309

[a] In Primitiva Eccleſia non erat de fide ſubſtantiam panis in corpus Chriſti converti *Joh. Tribarn. in 4 Sent. Diſt* 11. *Q.* 3. *Diſt.* 42. *Sect.* 1.

[b] *Scotus in* 4 *Diſtinct.* 11. *Queſt.* 3. *Artic.* 3.

understood and expounded. Fourthly, *the Cardinal of* [c] Cambray *adds, that the opinion which holds the substance of bread not to remain, doth not evidently follow of the Scripture, nor to his seeming of the Churches determination.* Fifthly, *Your* [d] *Secular Priests affirm, that it was concluded among the Fathers of the Society,* (and what Catholick would not believe them?) *that the Fathers have not so much as touched the point of Transubstantiation.* Sixthly, *It is no wonder,* saith [e] Gregory de Valentia, *if one or two, or more of the Ancients have thought or written of this matter not so considerately and rightly.* And [f] *Bellarmin* confesseth *it is not to be wondred at, if* St. Austin, Theodoret, *and other of the Ancients, speak something which in show seems to favour the Heretick.* The sayings of the ancient Fathers which interpret the words of Christ, *This is my Body,* in a figurative sence, as much as any Protestant can do; and which forced these Confessions from so many *Cardinals, Bishops, Schoolmen, Priests* and *Jesuites* are these; [g] *by Bread Christ represents his Body,* saith *Tertullian*; and again, [h] *Christ hath called Bread his Body, that thereby thou mayest understand, that he hath given to Bread the Figure of his Body.* And again, [i] *This is my Body,* that is, *the Figure of my Body.* St. [k] *Cyprian* noteth, *That it was Wine, even the Fruit of the Vine, which the Lord saith was his Blood. Our Lord,* saith St. [l] Clemens, *did bless Wine when he said,* Take drink this is my Blood,

c Distinct. 4. Qu. 6. A. 2.

d Discourse Modest. p. 13.

e Antequam quæstio illa de Transubstantiatione in Ecclesia palam agitaretur minimè mirum est, si unus aut alter aut etiam aliqui ex veteribus minus considerate & Rectè hâc de re senserint & scripserint de *Transub* l. 2. c. 7.

f Hinc discimus non esse mirandum si

Augustinus Theodoretus, & alii Veteres quædam dixerint, quæ in speciem videntur favere hæreticis L. 2. *Euch.* c. 25 p. 649. B.

g Panem corpus suum representat. l. 1. adv. *Marcion.* c. 14.

h Panem corpus suum appellat ut & hinc jam eum intelligas corporis sui figuram pani dedisse, L. 3. c. 19.

i L. 4. c. 40. k Ep. 63. §. 6. p. 175. l Pædag. l. 1. c. 6. p. 100, & 106.

and

and that it was Wine which was blessed, he sheweth again saying, I will no more drink of the Fruit of the Vine. 2. *Our Lord in the Gospel of* St. John, *doth otherwise expound Meat by Symbols, when he saith,* Eat my Flesh, and Drink my Blood, *an evident Symbol of Faith and the promises.* And again, *there is a double Blood of the Lord, one Carnal, by which we are redeemed from destruction, and another Spiritual, by which we are Anointed.* Origen speaks thus,[m] *It is not the matter of bread, but the word spoken which profiteth him that doth not unworthily eat thereof, and these things I speak of the Typical and Symbolical Body.* To the Fathers of the first three hundred years we will add the Testimonies of those that flourished in the 4th, the first whereof shall be[n] *Eusebius*, who saith, 'That our Saviour delivered to 'his Disciples the Symbols of his Divine Dispensation, commanding them to make the Image of 'his own Body, and appointing them to use 'bread for the Symbol of his body. And that 'o we still celebrate upon the Lords Table the 'memory of his Sacrifice, by the Symbols of his 'Body and Blood, according to the Ordinances 'of the New Testament. And lastly, [p] Our 'Saviour and Lord first, and then all the Priests 'that have followed in all Nations, celebrating 'the Spiritual Divine Service according to the 'Ordinances of the Church, signifie unto us by 'the bread and wine, the Mysteries of his body 'and blood. [q] *Athanasius* saith, 'That Christ 'distinguished the Spirit from the Flesh, that 'we might learn that the things he spake were 'not Carnal but Spiritual: For how many then 'might his body have sufficed, that it might 'be the food of the whole world? it is as if he 'should have said, that which is given for the 'world

Pædag. l. 1. c. 6. p. 100. & 106.

Pæd. l. 2. c. 2.

[m] Nec materia panis sed super illum dictus sermo est, qui prodest non indigne Domino conedenti illum, & hæc quidem de typico symbolicoque corpore *Origen in Mat.* 15. p. 17. *Colon.*

[n] Euseb. l. 8. c. 1.

[o] Euseb. Demonst. l. 1. c. 10. p. 27.

[p] Demonstr. l. 5. c. 3. p. 148.

[q] Serm. in illud quicunque dixerit verbum, p. 979.

'world, ſhall be given for meat, that it may 'be Spiritually given to all. In the Church, ſaith [r] *Marcarius*, 'is offered bread and wine, the 'Type of his Fleſh and Blood; and they which 'are partakers of the viſible bread, do Spiritual-'ly eat the Fleſh of our Lord. Now we ſhall 'be partakers of the Paſſeover, ſaith [s] *Gregory* '*Nazianzen*, but as yet in a Figure, though 'more clear then in the Old Law: For the 'Paſſover of the Law, (I will be bold to ſay it) 'was but a more obſcure figure of a figure. Elſe-where he calls the Symbols 'the [t] Antitypes of 'the precious body or blood of the Lord: under 'the Type of bread the body is given to thee, 'and under the Type of wine the blood. So St. [u] *Cyril Hieroſ.* [x] *Pſeudo Clemens* ſaith, 'That 'Chriſt having given us the Myſteries figura-'tive of his precious body and blood, &c. *went* '*up into the Mount of Olives*: and that [y] the My-'ſtical and unbloody Sacrifice, is celebrated by 'the Symbols of his body and blood. And he 'adds, That in the Participation of this Sacra-'ment they uſed this thanksgiving, [z] *We give thee thanks our Father, for the precious blood of Jeſus Chriſt, which was ſhed for us, & for the precious body, of which we celebrate theſe Signs by his command to announce his Death.* Of the ſame Judgment were the Latine Fathers, for [a] *Ambroſe* in the fourth Book of the Sacraments, *Chap.* 5. affirmeth, that in his time this clauſe was in the publick Service, *make this Oblation to be ſet to our account acceptable and reaſonable, which is the figure of the*

r Ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προσφέρεται ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπου τύπος σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ, καὶ οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες ἐκ τοῦ φανεροῦ ἄρτου εὐμαρῶς τὸ σῶμα Κυρίου ἐσθίουσι. Macar. Ægypt. Hom. 27. p. 164.

s Orat. 2 de Paſch. To. 1. p. 692.

t In Epita. Gorgon. p. 187.

u Catech. Myſt. 4. p. 237.

x Conſtit. l. 5. c. 16.

y Conſtit. l. 6. c. 23.

z L. 5. c. 16

a Dicit Sacerdos: fac nobis hanc oblationem aſcriptam rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod eſt figura Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti.

b Hic in imagine quidem Chriſtus offertur, in cælo verò in veritate L. 1. Officiorum. cap. 48. T. 1. p. 37.

body

body and blood of the Lord. And again, [b] *Christ* here ſaith, *he is offered in the Image, in Heaven in the Truth.* Hilary the Deacon ſaith, [c] *The blood is a witneſs of divine benefit, for the Figure of which we receive the myſtical Cup of Blood for the preſervation of the Body and the Soul.* Gelaſius ſaith, [d] *indeed the Image and the ſimilitnde of the body and blood of Chriſt are celebrated in the action of the Myſteries.*

[b] Nam & Moſes accepto ſanguine vituli in patera aſperſit filios *Iſrael*, dicens hoc eſt Teſtamentum-- hoc figura fuit Teſtamenti --- Teſtamentum ergo ſanguine conſtitutum eſt: Quia beneficii divini ſanguis teſtis eſt, in cujus typum nos calicem Myſticum Sanguinis ad tuitionem corporis noſtri & animæ percipimus. *In* 1 *Cor.* 11.

[d] Certe Imago & Similitudo corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti in actione myſteriorum celebrantur. *Contra Eutych.*

In the Fifth Century, St. *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaks thus, [e] *if really Chriſt dyed not, of what is this Celebration Symbola; ſee how he ſtudies to make us alwayes mindful of his death, hence by the Sacraments he calls to mind his paſſion.* Again, *it is a carnal thing to doubt how Chriſt could give his fleſh to eat, we ought to underſtand it Myſtically and ſpiritually: his words were ſpiritual, and had nothing carnal in them.* Hom. 47. in T. 2. p. 75c.

[e] Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἀπέθανεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τίνος σύμβολα τὰ τελούμενα; ἔφης· ὅταν γένηται σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ αἷμα· ἀεὶ ἀναμιμνήσκει ὅτι ἀπέθανεν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. διὰ τοῦτο ἀναμιμνήσκει τοῦ πάθους διὰ τῆς μυσταγωγίας. Hom. 82. in Matthæum T. 2. p. 510.

Theodoret ſpeaks thus, [f] *Our Saviour changed the names, and gave unto the body that which is the name of the Symbol, and to the Symbol the name of*

[f] Ὁ δεσπότης ὁ ἡμέτερος μετέθηκε τὰ ὀνόματα, καὶ τῷ μὲν σώματι τὸ τοῦ συμβόλου τέθεικεν ὄνομα. τῷ δὲ συμβόλῳ τὸ τοῦ σώματος· ἵνα τοῦτο ἀμφοτέρων ἐαυτὸν ὀνομάσας αἷμα τὸ συμβολον ἀποκηρύξειεν. -- ἐβουλήθη γὰρ πως τὴν θείαν μυσταγωγίαν μὴ λαγχάνοντας μή τι φύσει τὸ ἐκπομπεύειν ὑπολάβωμεν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ὀνομάτων ἀναλλαγὴν πιστεύειν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ χάριτος γεγενημένην μεταβολήν. Ὁ γὰρ διὰ τὸ φύσει σῶμα οὐκ ἂν ἔτι ἄρτον προσηγορεύσας, καὶ αὖ πάλιν ἑαυτὸν αἷμα εἰπὼν ὀνομάσας, οὐ τὰ ὀφθέντα συμβολα τὴν τοῦ σώματος

σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορίᾳ τετίμηκεν, οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλὼν ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προστεθεικώς. *Theodoret Dial.* 1. *T.* 4. *p.* 17, 18. *G.* 12.

the body. So when he had named himself the Vine, he called that which was the Symbol the blood. And when the Heretick desired to know the reason of this change of names, he gives it thus, *Christ would have those who are partakers of the Divine Mysteries, not to attend unto the nature of the things they see, but by reason of the change of names to believe that change which is made by Grace: For he that called that which was Wheat and Bread, his natural body, and again calls himself a Vine; he honoured the Symbols which are seen with the appellation of his body and his blood, not changing the nature, but adding Grace unto it.* And ween the Heretick had granted that the Sacrament contained the Symbols of a real body; [g] *This is well answered saith the Orthodox: For every Image ought to have his Architype, and Painters imitate the nature, and paint the Images of things visible.*

[g] Ἄριστα χρῆ γὰρ εἶναι τὸ τῆς εἰκόνος ἀρχέτυπον καὶ γὰρ οἱ ζωγράφοι τὴν φύσιν μιμοῦνται καὶ τῶν ὁρωμένων γράφουσι τὰς εἰκόνας. *Id. Dial.* 2. *T.* 4. *p.* 84.

Tract. 2. *in Exod. v. Supr.*

Gaudentius saith, that [*] *in the Bread the figure of Christs body is reasonably understood.* St. *Hierom*, that *the Lord did not offer Water, but Wine for a Type of his blood.* St. *Austin* saith, [h] *the Lord did not doubt to say this is my body, when he gave the sign of his body.* And most emphatically in these words, [i] *a preceptive speech forbidding a crime, or commanding something good or profitable is not figurative, but if it seems to command a crime, or forbid a good, then it is figurative. Unless ye eat*

[h] In Typo sanguinis sui non obtulit aquam sed vinum. *l.* 2. *adv. Jovinian. p.* 27. *F.*

[i] Dominus non dubitavit dicere hoc est corpus meum, quum signum daret corporis sui. Contr. Adimantum. *c.* 12. *T.* 6. *p.* 128.

the

the flesh of the Son of Man, &c. Seems to command a wickedness, it is therefore a figure commanding us to Communicate with the Passion of our Lord, and sweetly and profitably to lay it up in our memory, that his flesh was crucifyed and wounded for us. Again [l] *the Sacraments are signs of things, being one thing, and signifying another.* Again (the Israelites) *did* [m] *drink of the spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ: see therefore, faith remaining, how the signs are varied, there the Rock was Christ, to us that which is placed upon the Altar is Christ.* Lastly, [n] *thou hast Christ present by faith, and in the sign, by the Sacrament of Baptism, and the meat and drink of the Altar. According to his carnal presence it is truly said to his Disciples, me you shall not have alwayes, how shall I send my hand to Heaven that I may hold him sitting there? † send thy faith and thou dost hold him.*

[k] Si preceptiva locutio est aut flagitium, aut facinus vetans; aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam jubens, non est figurata. Si autem flagitium aut facinus videatur jubere, aut utilitatem, aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata est.

Nisi manducaveritis, inquit Christus, *Joh.* 6. 53. Carnem, *&c.* Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere. Figura est ergo precipiens passioni Domini esse communicandum, & suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria, quòd pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa & vulnerata sit. *L.* 3. *de Doctr. Christian. c.* 16.

[l] Sacramenta sunt signa rerum aliud existentia, aliud significantia, Idem contra *Maxim. S.* 3. *cap.* 22. *T.* 6. *p.* 522.

[m] Bibebant de spirituali sequente petra: petra autem erat Christus. Videte ergo petrâ manente signa variata ibi petra Christus, nobis Christus, quod in altari Dei ponitur, *Id. Tract.* 45 *in Joh. T.* 9. *p.* 333.

[n] Habes Christum in præsenti per fidem, in presenti per signum, in presenti per Baptismatis Sacramentum, in presenti per altaris cibum & potum. -- Secundum presentiam carnis recte dictum est Discipulis me autem no semper habebitis -- Quomodo absentem tenebo? Quomodo in cœlum manum mittam, ut ibi sedentem teneam? Fidem mitte & tenuisti, *Idem Tract.* 50. *in Joh. T. eod. p.* 358, 371.

To conclude, the Fathers po expresly say, that Christ pronounced of the Bread, this is my body, and of the Wine, this is my Blood, which, say the R. Doctors, *had our Lord affirmed, we must have*

have understood him figuratively and metaphorically.

B. *Morton of the Mass l. 2. chap. 6. §, 6,*

"For proof hereof, behold a Torrent of ancient Fathers pressing upon you *Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Hierom, Ambrose, Agustine, Cyril* of *Hierusalem, Cyril* of *Alexandria, Theodoret, Gaudentius Cyprian, Clemens* of *Alexandria*, and *Isidore*, thirteen to the dozen, whose sayings we may best know by their own Idiom and Tenure of speech. The first noting Christ *to have confessed Bread to have been his body.* The second Christ *to have called Bread his body.* Third, that *Christs speech was spoken of Bread.* The fourth, *that that which he brake, was Bread.* The fifth, *that it was Bread which he brake.* The sixth, *that it was Bread of the Lord, & not Bread the Lord.* The seventh, *that the words (my Body) were spoken of the Bread.* The eighth, *that Christ saith, of the Bread this is my Body;* And the same Father, as if he had studied to take away all scales of doubtfulness from the eyes of our minds, illustrates the matter thus: *So* (saith he) *did Christ call his Body Bread, as elsewhere he calleth his Flesh a grain of Wheat;* (except the grain of Wheat die, it bringeth forth no fruit.) The ninth, *that Christ gave to the Bread the name of his Body.* The tenth, *that Christ said of the consecrated Bread, this is my*

1. Accipiens panem corpus suum esse confitebatur. *Irenæus l. 4. c. 57,*

2. Christus panem corpus suum appellat *Tertullianus. adv Judæos,*

3 Nec materia panis est, sed super illum dictus sermo qui prodest non indigne comedenti. *Orig in Mat. 15.*

4 Nos audiamus panem quem fregit Dominus esse corpus servatoris. *Hieron. Ep. ad Helvid. Qu. 2.*

5. Panem fractum tradidit discipulis suis dicens Accipite hoc, *&c. Ambrose l. 4. de Sacrament. cap. 5.*

6. Judas manducavit panem Domini, *&c. Augustinus Tract. 59. in Joh. Cyril. Hieros,*

7. Εἰποντος περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου τοῦτό μου ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα, *Catech, Myst. 4, p, 528,*

8. Cum ipse Christus sic affirmat, ac dicat de pane Hoc est corpus meum, *&c. Cyril, Alex. Catech. 4*

9. τοῦ μὲν σώματι τὸ τοῦ συμβόλου τέθεικεν ὄνομα, τοῦ δὲ συμβόλου τὸ τοῦ σώματος, *Theod. Dial. 1. c. 8.* 10. Gaudent tract. de rat. sacra.

"*Body*

" *Body*. The eleventh, *that it was Wine which he* " *called his Blood*. The twelfth, *that he blessed* " *Wine, when he said drink*, and the last; the " *Bread strengthning mans Body, was therefore called* " *the Body of Christ*. To these citations add that of *Cyprian* and † *Theophilus*, *the Lord calleth Bread his Body, which is made up of many grains*, and that of *Tatian*, or † *Ammonius having taken the Bread, then afterward the cup of Wine, and testified it to be his Body and Blood, he commanded them to eat and drink thereof; Forasmuch as it was the memorial of his future Passion and Death*: That also of * *Theodoret, that in the institution of the mysteries Christ called Bread his Body, and that which was mixt his blood*; And as if this was beyond all dispute, he puts this question to the Heretique, * *knowest thou that God called Bread his proper Body*, and makes him answer; *yea I know it*. By all which passages, and many more that might be cited it appeareth, that in those elder times the words of the institution were no otherwise conceived, than as if Christ had plainly said, *this Bread is my Body, and this Wine is my Blood*: and therefore that they did as certainly conceive the sense and meaning of these words, this is my Body, to be Metaphorical and figurative, as any Protestant now doth: note also by the way, that this sufficiently checks the clamors of *T. G.* against the Doctor, for saying, *they believe Bread to be God*, for let him put what sense he can upon the Fathers words, the same will justifie the words of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, which being Written to a *Protestant Lady* were very proper and lyable

11. Vinum fuisse quod sanguinem suum dixit Christus *Cyprian. Ep.* 63.

12. *Clem. Alex. Padag. l.* 2. *c.* 3

13. Panis, quia confirmat corpus, ideo corpus Christi nuncupatur. *Isidor. l.* 1. *de officiis. cap.* 8.

a Dominus corpus suum panem vocat. Ep. 76.

b In Evan, l, 1, *p*, 152, *L*, 2.

c Mox accepto pane deinde vini calice corpus esse suum ac sanguinem testatus manducare illos jussit, *&c. Ammon. Harmon. Evang. T.* 3. *Biblioth Patr, p.* 28.

* Ἐν ᾗ γε τῶν μυστηρίων παραδόσει σῶμα τὸν ἄρτον ἐκάλεσε, καὶ αἷμα τὸ κρᾶμα, *Dial.* 1, *T*, 4, *p*, 17,

* ΟΡΘ. Οἶσθα ὅτι ἄρτον ὁ θεὸς τὸ οἰκεῖον προσηγόρευσε σῶμα; ΕΡΑΝ Οἶδα, Id. ibid.

to

to no exception, since they import this only, *that the Romanist believes that to be a God, which we believe is Bread*, and to one of that perswasion, the Doctors argument is a most powerful disuasive from the embracing of the Roman faith, but to proceed.

To all these Fathers we will adjoyn three Councils. The first, is that of *Carthage* (held *An. Dom.* 397. by above Two hundred Bishops: (whereof St. *Austin*, and *Aurelius* were two) which thus decrees, that [a] *in the Holy mysteries nothing be offered but only the body and blood of the Lord. (as also the Lord commanded it,) that is the Bread and the Wine mingled with water.* The second is that of *Trull*, whose judgment *Balsamon* relateth in these words. [b] *The 32 Canon of the Synod of* Trull *giveth an ordinance at large, that the unbloody Sacrifice be made with Bread and Wine mingled with water, because Bread is the figure of the Lords body, and the Wine a figure of his blood.* [c] *Zonaras* saith the same. In the Seventh Council of *Constantinople* held *An. Dom.* 754. by Three hundred thirty eight *Bishops* the Bread is called [d] *the holy Image of* Christ, *and the true Image of his natural body, and the Image of his flesh given by God.* And this was certainly the Doctrine of the Church of *England* about 650 years agoe, witness the Homily appointed publickly to be read to the People upon *Easter-day*, before they did receive the Sacrament, where we have these words, viz.* *Much is betwixt the body Christ suffe-*

[a] ἵνα ἐν ἁγίοις μηδὲν πλεὸν τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου προσενεχθείη, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος παρέδωκεν τουτέστι ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου ὕδατι μεμιγμένου, Cod. Can. Eccles. Afr. c. 37.

[b] ὁ λϐ. κανὼν τῆς ἐν τῷ τρούλλῳ συνόδου πλατέως θεσπίζει γίνεσθαι τὴν ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν μετὰ ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου μεμιγμένου ὕδατι ὡς τοῦ μὲν ἄρτου τύπον ἔχοντος τοῦ κυριακοῦ σώματος τοῦ δὲ οἴνου τύπον τοῦ αἵματος, Bals. in Can. 40. Syn. Carthag. p. 653.

[c] In *Can.* 40. *Concil. Carthag. p.* 426, 427.

[d] ἡ εἰκὼν αὐτοῦ ἁγία, — τὸν τῆς ἐυχαριστίας ἄρτον ὡς ἀψευδῆ εἰκόνα τῆς φυσικῆς σαρκὸς, θεοπάραδοτος εἰκὼν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.

* Aelfrick Saxon Homily. v. Usher. *Answ. to the Jesuits challenge. p.* 79.

red

red in, and the body that is hallowed to houſel, the body truly that Chriſt ſuffered in, was born of the fleſh of Mary, *with blood and with bone, with ſkin and with ſinews, in humane limbs, with a reaſonable ſoul living, and his ſpiritual body, which we call the houſel, is gathered of many Corns, without blood and bone, without limb, without Soul; and therefore nothing is to be underſtood therein bodily, but ſpiritually. This myſtery is a pledge and a figure, Chriſts body is truth it ſelf. And again, Chriſt hallowed Bread and Wine to houſel before his ſuffering, and ſaid, this is my body and my blood. Yet he had not then ſuffered: but ſo notwithſtanding he turned through inviſible vertue, the Bread to his own body, and that Wine to his blood, as he before did in the Wilderneſs, before that he was born to men, when he turned that heavenly meat to his fleſh, and the flowing water from that ſtone to be his own blood.* The like matter alſo was delivered to the Clergy by the *Biſhops* at their *Synods*; out of two or three writings of the ſame *Æſrick*: in the one one whereof directed to[c] *Wulfſine* Biſhop of *Shirburn*, we read thus. *That houſel is Chriſts body, not bodily but ſpiritually. Not the body which he ſuffered in, but the body of which he ſpake, when he bleſſed Bread and Wine to houſel the night before his ſuffering; and ſaid by the bleſſed Bread, this is my body: and again by the holy Wine, this is my blood which is ſhed for many in forgiveneſs of ſins.* In the other written to *Wulfſtane Archbiſhop of* York, thus, *The Lord which hallowed houſel before his ſuffering, and ſaith that the Bread was his own body, and that the Wine was truly his blood, hallow-eth daily by the hands of the Prieſt, Bread to his body, and Wine to his blood in ſpiritual myſtery, as we read in books. And yet notwithſtanding that lively Bread is not bodily ſo, nor the ſelf-ſame body*

[c] Impreſs *Lond.* cum Homil. Paſchali & Ms. in Bibl. Bodl.

that Christ ſuffered in: nor that holy Wine is that Saviours blood which was ſhed for us, in bodily thing, but in ſpiritual underſtanding.

But now if *T. G.* ſhould deny all this that is the teſtimony of almoſt all the Fathers of the Church, and the confeſſions of ſo many Cardinals and Schoolmen, and of the Fathers of the Society aforeſaid, to prove that Tranſubſtantiation is a late upſtart Doctrine and that the Scripture is to be interpreted according to the mind of Proteſtants, to ſhew the unreaſonableneſs of this denyal, I would propoſe this caſe to his conſideration and the Readers, *viz.* in ſuppoſition that a controverſie ariſe in this preſent age about the ſenſe of a Law which was made 500 years paſt, and that a conſiderable number of thoſe who framed the novel expoſition ſhould confeſs, that for the laſt Two hundred years the contrary, to what they maintained was generally received in the Kingdom as the ſenſe of the Law, and ſhould farther confeſs that the moſt eminent Lawyers of the former ages from the firſt *enacting* of the Law, held the ſame with the latter; Nor had there ever been any diſagreement, or *oppoſition* among them in that point; whether it be not a *ſufficient* proof, that what they taught to be the ſence of the Law, was generally received as the ſence and meaning of it from the beginning? The Teſtimonies themſelves of thoſe antient Lawyers would be conviction enough: how much more when ſtrengthned by the confeſſion of the adverſe party it ſelf? Now if this be ſo in the delivery of the ſenſe of a *human Law*, where it happens very often that great Lawyers may be, and often are of *different judgments*; how much more in the delivery of a Divine Doctrine where the Paſtors of the Church are bound to deliver what they received, and the ſucceeding age is ſtill bound

bound to receive what they delivered? surely, if we add to this the confession of the very Adversaries themselves, the proof (as St. *Irenæus* saith) must be *true and without contradiction*; for if the Testimony of Ten Fathers; and a few false impertinent confessions of our meanest Writers, was by *T. G.* esteemed sufficient cause of this Triumphant flourish, the Testimony of so many hundred Fathers of the Church, and the confession of so many Cardinals and Schoolmen Jesuits and Fathers of the *Roman* party must be a demonstration of the truth of our assertion and exposition of the words of Christ, sufficient to convince the obstinacy of this vain Apostate; wherefore I shall conclude with that most pertinent exhortation of the learned *Origen.*[d] *If you be Sons of the Church, if you are imbued with Gospel Mysteries, and if the word made flesh doth dwell within you, acknowledge these are figures which are written in the Sacred Volumns, and therefore understand ye what is written as spiritual, and not as carnal men, for if as carnal you receive them, they will hurt, but will not nourish you. There is in the New Testament a letter which killeth him that doth not spiritually understand it, for if according to the letter you do follow that which is said, except you eat the flesh,* &c. *the letter killeth*:

Hence we may see the vanity of this assertion of *T. G.* That the definition of the present Church of *Rome* (for that is most absurdly called the Church-Catholick. *p.* 252.) is ground sufficient to believe the Doctrine of Transub-

d Hæc qui audire nescit detorqueat ortasse. & avertat auditum, secundum illos qui [illegible]icebant [illegible]uom[illegible]do [illegible] o[illegible] bis carnem suam manducare sed vos. Si fi[illegible] estis Ecclesiæ si Evangelicis imbuti mysteriis si verbum caro factum habitat in vobis, agnoscite quia figuræ sunt quæ in divinis voluminibus scripta sunt, & ideo tanquam spirituales & non tanquam carnales examinate & intelligite quæ dicuntur. Si enim tanquam carnales ista suscipitis lædunt vos & non alunt-Est & in N. Testamento litera quæ occidit *&c. ut supra. Orig. in Levit. c.* 10. *Hom.* 7. *p.* 87.

ſtantiation. Whereas it is confeſſed by their moſt learned Writers, that in *primitiva Eccleſia non erat de fide, i. e.* this was not any Article of Faith delivered to her by the antient Church, and that the *thing* as well as *name* of Tranſubſtantiation *is very rarely mentioned by the antient Fathers*, Nay, they ſpake nothing of it: And it is evident from the clear pregnant Teſtimonies, and the concurrent judgment of many Hundred Fathers that the Church of Chriſt did generally hold the contrary to what the Church doth now define, and held that expoſition of our Saviours words was true and Genuine, which they have now condemned as Heretical. 2. How can we know what is the preſent judgment of the Church of *Rome*, but by our eyes and ears, ſince therefore one of her determinations is, that all our ſenſes in the *Euchariſt* do actually deceive us, how can we be infallibly aſſured of her judgment by what ſhe hath declared to be fallacious?

e De Tranſubſtantiatione panis in corpus Chriſti rara eſt in antiquis ſcriptoribus mentio Alphonſus a caſtro de Hær. l. 8. v. indulgentia.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

The CONTENTS.

The Hoſt was not worſhipped with Latria *in in the primitive Church.* 1. *Becauſe we have no command in Scripture for this worſhip,* §. 1. 2ly. *Becauſe the Holy Scripture and the Fathers have ſpoken things extremely contradictory to this worſhip.* §. 2. *Thirdly, Becauſe the Antient Fathers have not informed us of this Worſhip.* §. 3. *Fourthly, Becauſe they have both ſaid and practiſed many things which are very inconſiſtent with this Opinion, that it ought thus to be Worſhipped.* §. 4. *An Objection Anſwered.* §. 5. *The Inſtances produced by* T. G. *to prove this practiſe are conſidered.* §. 6.

THe Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation being overthrown, the Adoration of the Hoſt muſt fall together with it. But ſince *T. G.* affirms, *That it was Univerſally practiſed and recommended by the Fathers of the primitive Church, both Greek and Latine,* whereas it was not practiſed or commended by any ſingle perſon for Eight hundred years after the coming of our Saviour; We ſhall proceed to evidence the vanity and the abſurdneſs of this practiſe, and the unconſcionable falſhood of this bold aſſertion. And, 1. *The commandment to Worſhip God alone*

Sect. 1. p. 222.

of Transubst. P. 338.

is so express (saith Bishop Taylor*) the distance betwixt God and what our senses represent as bread, so vast, the danger of Worshipping that which is not God, or of not Worshipping that which is God, is so formidable, that it is infinitely to be presumed, that if it had been intended that we should have Worshipped the Holy Sacrament, the Holy Scripture would have call'd it* God, *or* Jesus Christ, *or have bidden us in express terms to have Adored it, that either by the first, as by a reason indicative, or by the second, as by a reason imperative we might have had sufficient warrant, direct, or consequent, to have paid Divine Worship to it.* To strengthen and confirm this Argument it may deserve to be considered, 1. That the Evangelists and the Apostle *Paul* are very punctual in the Relation of what our Saviour did, or enjoyned in this Institution; they all inform us that Christ commanded them to eat the Bread and drink the Cup which he had given to them; and had he given them to be adored, would they, who mention things so obvious, forget to tell us that either Christ intended they should be Adored, or that they were Adored by them? that which induced St. *Paul* to mention this Institution, and to assert that he received it from our Lord, was the irreverence of those

1 Cor. 11, 18, 28. that did participate, and their want of preparation to receive those Holy Mysteries. To cure this disease he tells them, that the Holy Sacrament was Christs own Institution, the charge he left behind him *that very night in which he was betrayed*, and that the Institution was intended for the Commemoration of our Saviours death; all which is proper to beget within us a greater Reverence and care in celebration of these holy mysteries; but yet it cannot be denyed that this consideration, viz. *That what they thus irreverently*

rently treated, was that very Son of God which ſuffered for them, and that it was that Hoſt which they and all good people did Worſhip for their God. I ſay, this one conſideration would have been infinitely more proper and effectual to aggravate the ſin of thoſe who ſlighted it, and irreverently behaved themſelves at the participation of this Sacrament. This therefore was omitted by St. *Paul* upon no other ſcore but the abſurdity and falſhood of the thing.

Secondly, conſider with what expreſeneſs the Scripture doth inform us that Chriſt *is God, true God, God bleſſed for evermore*, and yet becauſe his converſation in the World was in the habit and likeneſs of a Man, and his Divinity was hid under the veil of humane fleſh, and becauſe this *Jeſus* was made ſubject to an ignominious and accurſed death, the Scripture thinks it not ſufficient to aſcribe unto him in 100 places the nature & proprieties of God, and to leave us upon Record, [a] examples of his Adoration by the wiſe Men of the *Eaſt*, and by his own Diſciples, and by divers others. I ſay the Scriptures think it not ſufficient to have done all this, and therefore they inform us that this is the decree of Heaven, *that to the name of Jeſus every knee ſhould bow, and that all ſhould honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*, and that when this firſt born came into the World *Gods Angels were commanded to Adore him*: now it is evident the humane nature did not ſo much conceal the Deity, as do the accidents of Bread, for God ſometimes did appear unto his Prophets in a human ſhape, but never in the ſhape of Bread and Wine. Chriſt while encompaſſed with our fleſh, gave ſignal demonſtrations of his Divine perfections by Miracles, and by declaring that he knew the thoughts

[a] Mat. 2. 11, 8, 2, 9, 18, 15, 25, 20, 20, 28, 9, 17. Phil. 2, 10. Joh. 5, 23. 1 Heb. 6.

of those with whom he did converse, but in the Sacrament Christ giveth not the least appearance or demonstration of his presence; He doth not rescue his most Sacred body from the *Mouse* or *Rat*, or from the Sacriligious hands of Theives, and Sorcerers. Here then was greater reason to have told us as often, *that the Sacrament was God, and was to be adored*, as they have told us *Christ was God, and was to be adored* Since therefore we have no precept or example in the Holy Scripture for adoration of the Sacrament, nor any information that the nature and properties of God do belong unto it; seeing it is asserted of the *Rock*, and of the *Church* that they are *Christ*, and of the Saints, that they are made *Partakers of the Divine nature*; but it is not once asserted of the Sacrament that it is Christ, or that it *partakes of his Divinity*, but only that it his body; we have just reason to conclude that it neither was adored by Christs Disciples, nor was intended so to be.

1 Cor. 10. 4, 6, 15. 1 Pet. 2. 4.

Arg. 2, § 2. Brevint, p. 72.

If that which Romanists adore were truly Christ, one might safely aver (what even to think were Blasphemy) 'That neither Prophets 'nor Holy Fathers in their Speeches against Hea-'thenish Gods, either considered well what they 'said, or ever thought well of their Saviour. 'And First, to begin with their Original, when 'the Prophet *Isaiah* inveighs against them who 'worship Gods made by a Carpenter, of a Tree 'which the worshipers had Planted, and after 'hewen into pieces, whereof one was to heat 'an Oven, and the other to make a God. Can 'any rational Man think that the Holy Ghost did 'foresee, That all true Worshippers in the time 'of the *Messias*, were to adore a God every mor-'ning made of, and every morning inclosed with-

'in,

'in, ſomewhat of that Wheat that firſt Coun-
'trey Men had ſown, and Bakers baked into
'Wafers, of which afterwards an Apothecary
'was to take ſome to wrap Pills in, and the Prieſt
'all the reſt to Conſecrate into a God? And if
'the taking that for a God, which before the
'Conſecration was but a Stock, is a Pagan blind-
'neſs, fit for a Prophet to wonder at, *v.* 18. Is
'the adoring that for a Saviour, which imme-
'diately before the uttering of ſome few words,
'was a thin wafer, ſuch clear underſtanding as
'may become a Catholick? The Authour of the C 14. v. 20.
book of Wiſdom makes the Pagan folly chiefly to
conſiſt in this, That *they took him now for a God*
which a little before was not honoured as a Man.
Pagans melt Braſs, they caſt it, they ſet it up,
'they faſten it, ſaith *Minucius*, tis yet no God:
'they poliſh it, they adorn it, neither is it yet
'a God; But ſee now, they Conſecrate it, and
'Pray to it, then as ſoon as Men will have it to
'be a God, it is a God. p. 26. What! were
'theſe wiſe men blind not to perceive, that Pa-
'gans might return the ſame Raillery? Chriſti-
'ans, they ſow Wheat, they cut, gather, and
'threſh it, 'tis no Chriſt yet: they grind it, they
'ſift it, they bake it, 'tis but a wafer: they ſet
'it upon an Altar, they elevate it, they croſs it
'ſeveral times; no wonder yet: at laſt they
'ſpeak five words upon it; preſently ten Miracles
'break forth, and among an hundred Wafers,
'which are all like to one another, that which
'they are pleaſed to think upon, is their Savi-
'our. And though a little before it was not
honoured as a Man, it is now taken to be God.
'Beſides, all the Reproaches and Ironies which
'Holy Prophets or Chriſtian Fathers throw on
'Idols, fall twenty times more heavy on what is
adored

'adored at Maſs. For example, if you laugh at *Laban* for ſerving Gods which a man or woman can ſteal away, and ſay with them that comment on that place, *Summa cæcitas Deos vocat quos furtim auferri poſſe agnovit*, or with St. *Chryſoſtom*, *O Hyperboly of madneſs, are thy Gods ſuch as can be Stollen, art thou not aſhamed to ſay, why haſt thou ſtollen away my Gods?* Or if you laugh at *Micah* for crying out ſo miſerably, *you have taken away the Gods that I have made*, as others do; 'if you deride the *Babylonians* for carrying their 'Gods upon their Shoulders, who otherwiſe 'could not help themſelves, nor move out of the 'place where they were ſeated, as the Prophet 'Eſay doth. Or if you rally upon the Prieſts of *Bel* and *Nebo*, 'becauſe their Gods fall to the 'ground, and are carried away Captive. If with the Royal *Pſalmiſt* you endeavour to expoſe them by ſaying, *that they have mouths and cannot ſpeak, Eyes but cannot ſee; Feet, but cannot walk*: If with the Prophet *Jeremy*, you give theſe demonſtrations, that they are no Gods. Firſt, becauſe *they cannot ſave themſelves from ruſt and moth, though they be covered.* Secondly, *That they are not able to eſcape from War, and Thieves and Robbers.* And Thirdly, *That the Prieſts make faſt their Temples with Locks and Barrs, leaſt their Gods be ſpoiled with Robbers. They light them Candles, yea more then for themſelves, of which they cannot ſee one; and their hearts are gnawed upon by things creeping out of the Earth; and when they eat them and their Clothes, they feel it not.* And Fourthly, *That they are born upon Shoulders, having no Feet, whereby they declare unto Men they are nothing worth.* Fifthly, *That if they fall, they cannot riſe up again of themſelves, neither if one ſet them upright, can they move themſelves:*

Synopſis. T. 1. in Gen. p. 447. Jud. 18. 24: Iſa. 46. 7: Iſa. 46. 1. Pſal: 115. 5, 6, 7. Baruch. 6. 12. v. 15. 57. v. 18, 19. 20. v. 26, & 27

ſelves. Sixthly, *That their Gold and Silver, and Garments wherewith they are Clothed, they that are ſtrong do take and go away with all.* And laſtly, if you add, *That you know them to be no Gods, becauſe afterwards they ſhall be Eaten.* All theſe conſiderations do ſufficiently expoſe the vanity, both of theſe Idols, and of thoſe that worſhip them. But then what R. Catholicks eſteem their God, is capable of all theſe Ironies, and by all theſe conſiderations you may know aſſuredly that it is no God. v. 58. v. 72.

For Firſt, 'it falls oftner to the ground then 'ever *Nebo* did, witneſs [a] the injunction of ſcra- 'ping the ground where it falls, and cleanſing it. And being fallen to the ground, it cannot riſe again, witneſs the ſame command to [b] take it up. 'It is ſometimes ſtollen away, as the poor 'Gods of *Laban* were, and it doth nothing to 'defend and help it ſelf, witneſs [c] *Pope Innocents* 'Decree that it be ſo well kept that no raſh 'hand approach it; and [d] *Geraldinus*, his com- 'plaint to *Charles* the 5th, *That the very Body of 'his God was not ſafe from Thieves and Magicians, 'and from the fire of the Wicked.* It is ſometimes 'carried away captive box and all, as were the 'Heathenish Gods whom *Pagan Rome* had con- 'quered, witneſs St. *Lewis* the 9th. who being 'beaten, and in great diſtreſs, rendred it for a Pawn into the hands of the *Ægyptian Sultan*, inſomuch that to this day the *Ægyptian Eſcutcheons* by way of Triumph, bear upon it a Pix with a Wafer in it. In their proceſſions it is carried upon their Shoulders, as was *Bel* and *Nebo*, or if the Journey be long, it is hung about the Neck. 'To it agrees the whole deſcription, which the 'Pſalmiſt gives us of a Pagan Idol, for it hath 'Eyes and cannot ſee, it hath hands and handles 'not,

[a] De defect. circa Miſſ. p. 3. Si hoſtia, &c. locus ubi cecidit mundetur, & aliquantum abradatur.
[b] Reverenter accipiatur.
[c] Decretal. l. 3. Tit. 44 c. 1.
[d] *Alex. Gerald. in Ep. ad Carol. V. Egid. in Itin.* IPSUM DEI CORPUS. *Ritual. Rom.* p. 72.

'not, being deprived of the actual uſe of all its 'faculties and ſences, and ſo of all the [a] lights that 'burn before it, it beholds not one.

[a] Lampades coram eo plures, vel ſaltem una, die noctuque perpetuo colluceat. *Ritual. Rom. p.64.*

This God is alſo worſhiped, and afterwards 'his heart is gnawed upon by things creeping 'out of the Earth, and when they eat or drink 'him he feels it not. Witneſs that Injuction 'of the *Roman Miſſal*, 'That if the Hoſt be 'taken by a Mouſe, or any other Creature, and 'cannot be found, they do endeavour to take, 'kill and burn that Creature, and caſt the Aſhes 'under the Altar. And that when either Flies 'or Spiders chance to fall into the Chalice, be-'cauſe theſe little Beaſts cannot drink ſo little, 'but they drink him whole, and have him in 'their little Guts, the Prieſt muſt by all means 'ſwallow down theſe Flies and Spiders, if he 'can do it without the endangering of his Life, 'or fear of Vomiting. Once was the time that 'Ægypt was made aſhamed of their chief God, 'when they ſaw Mice creeping out of his Belly; 'what would they have ſaid, if they had ſeen 'their God creeping down, as the Maſs God 'doth, into the Belly of thoſe Mice or Flyes? God doth in Scripture often threaten a wicked Church or Nation, *that he would ſpue them out of his Mouth:* And were this Doctrine true, the Wicked of the Church of *Rome* might do the like to him; nay, they might not only vomit up their God, but cauſe him to be burnt, witneſs the conſtitution of the Maſs, *That if the Prieſt do vomit up the Euchariſt, and find the Species whole, he ſhould then reverently eat the Vomit; but if the Species appear not, he ſhould burn it.*

Si hoſtia conſecrata a mure, &c. p. 34.

Si muſca vel aranea &c. p. 35.

Theod. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 5. c. 22.

De defect. circa Miſſ. Occurrent. p. 38.

Thirdly, If *T. G.* rightly had aſſerted, that this was the continual practiſe of the ancient Church

Church, the ancient *Fathers* of the three first *Centuries* would not have quite neglected to inform us of it: some time or other, it is like, they would have styled *it God*, or *Jesus Christ*, or have declared that it was, or ought to have been Worshipped by them. For the absurdness of the thing to sense and reason, is so great and obvious, that it seems plainly to require more Apologyes than they bestowed to vindicate, and to wipe of the scandal of the Cross. At least it would have been remembered by *Justin Martyr*, or *Tertullian*, who undertake to give us an account of what the Christians practised in this case; and yet neither the *Romanists* themselves, nor their new Champion *T. G.* do cite one passage from them to confirm this practise. In the Fourth Century, it was the chief concern of all the Fathers to oppose the *Arians*, and all their under-Sects, and their chief Argument was this, that [b] Christ according to the precept of the Holy Scriptures and the practise of all Christians was adored, and therefore could not be a Creature. Now had the Adoration of the Host been the continual practise of that Age they lived in, how could they all forget and wave an Argument so plain and obvious, and so convincing as this practise doth afford; it being natural thus to conclude, *Christ in the Sacrament is Worshipped with* Latria, *and this Adoration is there tendered upon presumption of his Deity, and therefore he is God.* Since then the Fathers of those times did never use this Argument, certain it is the practise of the Church did give them no occasion so to do.

*P. 97. 98. Apol. c. 39.

[b] communis est illa S. Patrum argumentatio qua verum & æqualem Patri dicum esse probant filium quod, summo illo genere adorationis quam λατρειαν vocant, afficiatur Petavius. *Theol. Dog.* l. 2. c. 12. §5.

Thirdly, the *Marcionites* and *Valentinians* denyed that Christ did take upon him real flesh, and the great objection which forced them thus to slight the senses of all those that saw him, and all

all the evidence of reason in this case, was this, that they conceived it [i] *improper for the Son of God to be conceived in the Womb*, or come forth of it; The *Manichees* were also startled with the same objection, 'tis an unworthy thing saith [k] *Faustus ex utero credere Deum, & Deum Christianorum, to think that God, and especially the God of Christians should issue from a Womb.* The Synod held at *Ephesus* amongst the impious speeches of *Nestorius* takes special notice of this one, that he could not [l] *endure to Worship one that was two moneths old, or nourished by Milk.* And yet amongst all these and many other Hereticks, who were so highly scandalized at the humiliation of our Saviour, and at his sufferings on the Cross, we find not one that ever did except against this Adoration of him in the Sacrament, against the eating of their God, the mixing of him with their spittle, or with the ferment of the most depraved Stomach. During Eight hundred years we have not one complaint or scruple that the Christians God was pittiful immured and shut up in the shape of Bread and Wine, deprived of the use of all his faculties, and exposed to the Teeth of Vermin, which gives just reason to believe that what the Christians of those times did practise, gave no occasion to them to discourse these things, or to be scandalized with them. Besides in answer unto these exceptions, we do not find that any of the Fathers urged this practise, or undertook by saying that Christians did Adore him in the shape of Bread, did lodge him in their Stomachs, and the like, to shew that he might properly be God, and regularly Worshipped, although he lay concealed in the Womb, and was subjected unto the like infirmities with other children. Since then no other instance had been

i Turpe hoc deo, & indignum hoc dei filio, & stultum. Tertul. de carne Christi c. 4. D.

k August. contra Faustum Man. l. 3. cap. 6.

l διμηναῖον καὶ γαλακτοτραφέντα μὴ ἀνάσχεσθαι προσκυνεῖν Concil. Ephes. Acts 3, Extr. in Ep, Syn, ad Cler, CP, p. 335. ἐνταῦθα πολλάκις ἔφη διμηναῖον μὴ δεῖν λέγεσθαι θεόν, ib, Acts 1, p, 265.

been more proper to oppose to these objections then this Adoration of the Host, & yet the Fathers constantly declined it, we may be certain that they had no such practise, and that they did not hold that Doctrin from whence this practise took its rise.

Fourthly, If this had been the judgment of the Ancient Church, why did they [m] burn the Host? For can we possibly imagine any thing more hainous, then is the burning of that God we Worship? To prove that *Calvinists* do offer the most vile affronts to holy Saints and Martyrs, the * *Roman* Doctors hold it sufficient to affirm they burn their bodies and reliques, and cast their ashes into Rivers: And is it not a greater evidence of the abominable contempt these Fathers offered to our blessed Lord, that they did burn and bury that most sacred body which was united to the Divinity. To shew the great stupidity of Heathens in thinking that which they had made was God, the Prophet *Esay* tells them, *that part of the same Wood which makes the Image is burned in the Fire*; and the Prophet † *Jeremiah* layes down this strong conviction, that the Heathen Idols ought not to be esteemed Gods, *because when Fire fell upon their Temples they could not escape, but were consumed by it.* And can we then imagine that all Christians, during this custom were such sots as to imagine that to be God, which was not only subject to be consumed by, but was by them committed to the flames for this intent and purpose? was it not easie to retort upon the Christian that of the Prophet *Esaiah* that part of the same Corn which was converted into the Host, and of the Wine which was converted into the blood of Christ, served only to be meat and drink, and to descend into the Stomach and the draught. Fifthly,

[m] Hoc quod reliquum est de carnibus & panibus in igne incendi præcepit quod nunc videmus in Ecclesia sensibiliter fieri igniq; tradi quæcunq; remanere contigerit inconsumpta Hesyck l. 2. in Lev. c. 8.

* Bellarm. de Reliq. Sanctorum. l. 2. c. 1. To. 1 controv. 7.

† Baruch. c. 6. v. 55.

Fifthly, If this had been, the judgment of the ancient Church, why did they put the Host into the [n] Sepulchers of dying friends, or bury what they could not eat, since humane nature doth abhor to offer such affronts unto that God we Worship? The Prophet *Esay* to express what great contempt the Heathens in the time of Christ should shew unto their Idols, saith that they *shall cast them to the Moles and to the Batts*, & could a Christian cast his God unto the Worms, or lodge him with a stinking Carcase, and not be deemed to contemn him in a viler manner?

Sixthly, We read that [o] *Moses took the Calf and burnt it with fire, and ground it to powder, and strewed it upon the Water, and made the Children of* Israel *drink of it.* The ancient Fathers tell us, this was done to *teach them to contemn what they saw consumed and go down into the draught*; whereas this Romish Doctrine confutes both *Moses* and the Fathers, and lets us know that what we devour may be God, & that that which [p] *Origen* assures us goes down into the draught, is that which also ruleth in the Heavens.

v. Daille de Cultu Lat. l. 7. c. 30.

n ἔθος τὴν παλαιὸν μεταδιδόσας τοῖς νεκροῖς σώμασι τῶν τελευτησάντων τῶν σώματος καὶ τῶν αἵματος τῶν κυρίου, *Balsamon*, p. 460.

Isa. 1. 2. v. 20.

Exod. 32. v. 20.

o Vituli pulverem quem adoraverat *Israel*, in contemptum superstitionis, in potum accepit populus, ut discat contemnere quod in secessum projici viderat, Hieron. ad Fab. p. 20.

p Si quicquid ingreditur in os, in ventrem abit & in secessum ejicitur & ille cibus qui Sanctificatur per verbum Dei perque observationem juxta id quod habet materiale, in ventrem abit & in secessum ejicitur Orig. in Mat. 15. p. 17.

Seventhly, Let it be considered, that if the primitive Church had ever practised this Adoration of the Host, the Heathens would sure have retorted all those Arguments upon their heads, by which they did *reprove the Heathens for their Idol-worship, for the Christians upbraided them with Worshipping the works of their own hands, to which*

which themselves gave what figure they pleased, and then by certain forms *did Consecrate them, and made by* invocation, *as they supposed, a Divinity to dwell there. They objected to them, that they Worshipped that which could neither hear, nor see, nor smell, nor* Just. Martyr. Apol. 2.
tast nor move, and in particular θεὸς μορφὴν μὴ ἔχοντα things having not the shape of God, they upbraided them with Worshipping what they had baked in the Furnace, *and that which could grow old and perish, that could be broken and burned, that was subject to the injuries of Ratts and Mice, and Worms and creeping things, that can be taken by Enemies and carried away, that is not able either to revenge or help it self. Is it not the extremity of madness* saith St. [b] *Chrysostom to think men do not say or do what's filthy, when they go about to bring their Gods into the Images of Stone or Wood, and there to shut them up as in a Prison. Dost thou not see* saith [c] Clement, *That that which thou Adorest cannot see, dost thou not hear that it cannot understand? Your Gods are baked in the Potters Furnace* saith [d] Arnobius, *and wrought into those forms in which you see them.* 'As for your Gods they may be 'burnt, or broken, or perish saith *Lactantius*, for 'they are often broken by the fall of Houses, and 'often are consumed by fire; what madness there- 'fore is it to fear that whose Ruine, Theft, or 'Incension may be rather feared? what vanity to 'hope for help from them, who are not able to 'defend themselves? what perverseness is it to 'fly unto their aid, who being injured are unre- 'venged, unless revenged by their Worshippers. 'How great stupidity is it not to see it is a 'wickedness to think or say that men are keepers 'of the Gods. So [e] *Justin M.* 'Tis a shame to 'to Worship those whom thou defendest, and to 'hope for succour from them, whom thou thy

[b] Tom. 5. p. 51. 7.

[c] Recognit. l. 5. f. 30.

[d] Arnob. l. 6. p. 200. Fornacibus incocta figulinis.

[e] l. 2. c. 4.

Apol. p. 44

Ad Demetr p. 239. 'ſelf preſerveſt, ſaith St. [f] *Cyprian*. Theſe arguments are frequent in the mouths of Ancient Fathers; and had the Church then thought and practiced, as they have done at *Rome* in theſe laſt Ages, might not the Heathens 'have replyed, why may not we as well as you? 'do not you Worſhip that with Divine Honours, 'and call it your God, which can be burnt and 'broken, which your ſelves form into a round 'or ſquare figure, which the Oven firſt hardens, 'and then your Prieſts conſecrate, and by invo-'cation make to be your God, which can ſee no 'more, then the Silver and Gold upon our Ima-'ges? Do not you adore that which Rats and 'Mice eat, which can grow Mouldy and Sowre, 'which you keep under Locks and Barrs, for fear 'your God ſhould be ſtollen? True it is, that if we are beaten from our Cities, we carry our Gods with us. But doth not your Roman Ritual command the *Prieſt that undertakes a long and dangerous journey, to put his God up into a bag, and hang that bag about his Neck*, that ſo he may be carried with him? Let me then anſwer you in the words of your *Arnobius*, *how impudent and ſhameleſs is it to reprehend that in another which you do your ſelves?*

p. 72.

Contra Gentes l. 2

Sect. 5. And whereas ſome reply, that Chriſtians hid this practice from the Heathens, the vanity of this exception will be evident from this conſideration, That many who embraced the Chriſtian Doctrin, were by the heat of perſecution driven back to *Paganiſm*, who therefore were concerned to ſave their credit by divulging what they thought lyable to moſt exception in the Chriſtian practice: But this exception is ſo abundantly confuted by *Monſieur Daille*, that it is needleſs any further to conſider it. To conclude therefore, the Synod

De cultus objecto l. 2 c. 25. p. 181

of

of *Constantinople* held, *A. D.* 754. and consisting of the flower of the *Eastern Church*, determins thus, [a] *That Christ commanded an Image, excellent matter, or the substance of Bread to be offered, not having humane shape, least Idolatry should be introduced.* Now who knows not that the substance of Bread is not a proper object of *Latria*, and if that Christ God-man was properly contained in the Sacrament, there could be no suspition of Idolatry in the adoration of it. What I have thus discourſed, I judge sufficient to convince the Reader, that this was not the practice of the Ancient Church.

[a] Syn. 7. Act 6. T. 3. p. 756. Concil. T. 5.

What *T. G.* offers to the contrary is, that St. *Basil* saith, *the words of invocation, when the Eucharistical Bread was shewed, are Apostolical Tradition.* Ergo the Host was worshiped with *Latria*. *St.* Austins *Mother assisted at the Altar, from whence she knew the Holy Victim was dispenced.* Ergo the Host was Worshiped with *Latria*. *Optatus* calls the Altar *the Seat of the Body of our Lord.* Ergo the Host was Worshiped with *Latria*. He might have added that Protestants do call the Sacrament the Blood and Body of our Lord, they do uncover and shew it to the people, they therefore do adore it with *Latria*. These are the wretched Sophisms by which this universal practice is confirmed; and they prove only this, That the abettors of them do not renounce their sence and reason only, when they do believe this Doctrine, but also when they discourse on this unhappy Subject. §. 6. T G. p. 222, 223.

Thus when *T. G.* proceeds to tell us, That the *practice of the Church was so notorious in this point of the Adoration of the Eucharist, that the Heathens, because they knew that the Christians made use of Bread and Wine in the Mysteries, objected it to them,* p. 224.

that they Worſhiped Ceres *and* Bacchus: Nothing is ſo notorious, as is the weakneſs of this Inference. For if this argument be valid, the Heathens thought that Chriſtians Worſhiped *Ceres* and *Bacchus*, becauſe they uſed Bread and Wine in their Myſteries, therefore all Chriſtians Worſhiped what ſeemed to be Bread and Wine, this muſt be alſo valid; the Heathens thought that the Jews did Worſhip *Saturn*, becauſe they met on *Saturday*, (as the ſame *Auſtin* in the ſame place informs us) therefore all Jews Worſhiped *Saturday*. 2. St. *Auſtin* ſaith, and he himſelf confeſſeth, that the Heathens thus conceived, not becauſe they Worſhiped the likeneſs of Bread and Wine but becauſe they uſed Bread and Wine in their Myſteries, the bare uſe therefore, not the Worſhip of theſe things, was that which gave the riſe to this abſurd imagination, as St. *Auſtin* deems it.

Auguſt. contra Fauſt. Manuch. l. 20. c. 13.

Like to this ſtuff is that of *Chryſoſtom*, viz. *That the whole order of heavenly Powers lift up their voice, and the place round about the Altar, is filled in honour of him that lyeth upon it.* And that of *Nazianzen*, affirming, That *Gorgonia went with Faith to the Altar, and with a loud voice beſought,* τὸν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ τιμώμενον, *him that was honoured upon it.* For who knows not that Chriſt is honoured at the Holy Table, when by the invocation of his Holy name, the Sacrament of his true Body and Blood is Conſecrated, and to his Glory is diſtributed to all the Faithfull, who knows not, that the honour done to that which repreſents, and is the true memorial of our Bleſſed Lord, is Honour done to him? And therefore theſe expreſſions only ſignifie that Holy Angels and Good Chriſtians do honour the memorials of Chriſts Body; and this we Proteſtants do

T. G. p. 224.

p. 222.

do as truly, but more safely then the Church of *Rome*, witness the preparations made before we do receive them, and the Reverence we use when we receive them; and witness lastly our confession, *Eucharistiam, ut signum utile, divinitus institutum, venerandam confitemur*, saith *Albertinus*. And that *Nazianzen* could intend no more, is clear from what he doth immediately subjoyn, viz. That *if his Sister could lay hold of any of the Antitypes of our Lords Blood and Body, she presently bedewed them with her Tears.* What therefore lay upon the Altar, was only the *Antitype of Christs true Body.* This also was the mind of *Chrysostom*, for he declares, That *before the Bread is Sanctified, we name it Bread, but the Divine Grace Sanctifying it by the means of the Priest, it is freed from the name of Bread, and is esteemed worthy to be called the Lords Body, although the nature of Bread remaineth in it.*

In Epitaph Gorgon. p. 187

Epistol. ad Cæsar. Monach.

To the words of *Chrysostom*, cited from *Hom.* 24. in *Epist.* ad *Corinth* I answer, That *Chrysostom* doth here exhort us *to Worship Christs Body*, which we do, he also saith, *we see this Body on the Altar.* Nay, elsewhere he adds,* we see it slain and jugulated. [d] *And when the Hereticks do ask whence it is evident that Christ was Crucified, we stop their mouths saith he, by the consideration of these Mysteries; for if Christ be not Dead* τίνος σύμβολα τὰ τελώμενα, *what do these Symbols mean.* Christs Body therefore is seen upon the Altar, not as to its substance (for there according to the Roman Doctors, its being is invisible) but as to that Sacrament which represents his Body; this then must be the mind of *Chrysostom*, that Body which is really in Heaven, and in the Altar, is seen, slain, and jugulated in effigie, do you adore.

p. 224.

* ἔνθα ὁ χριστὸς κεῖται τεθυμένος. *Ad Pop. Antioc. Hom.* 15 κεῖται ἐσφαγμένος, *ib. Hom.* 14 *Vide Albert. l.* 2. *de Sacr. Euch.* p. 535, 536.

d In Mat. Hom. 82.

Hitherto

Hitherto we have complained only of the want of reason, in the citations following, we have just reason to suspect his want of Conscience For with what Conscience could he offer this passage of *f Theodoret* in confirmation of this practise, viz. *The mystical Symbols (* do not receed from their nature, for they abide in their proper substance, figure and form, and may be seen and touched as they were before, but they) are understood to be what they are made, and are believed and adored as being the things they are believed*; for can that be a Demonstration of this practise, which is a most convincing demonstration, that the supposition upon which the *Romanist* doth build this practise is absurd and false? And that the Adoration of the Host, would be the Adoration of what continues Bread, as certainly, as the humanity of Christ continues to retain its nature and its proper substance? had not *T. G.* sufficient reason to leave out these words, which are so clear a Condemnation of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and consequently of the Adoration of the Host, that their great Doctors are even forced to say, that by οὐσία substance, *Theodoret* doth understand no substance, but only accidents, which are the opposite to substance. And that by substance and nature he meaneth form and figure; though in this very place, he makes a clear distinction of substance both from form and figure, and consequently that he grants unto the Heretick, that Christs humanity, is as to the substance and the nature of it, changed into the Deity, and that the accidents, form and figure of it only remain unchanged, that is, he grants all that the Heretick asserts, and he endeavoured to refute.

f οὐδὲ γὰρ τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ σχήματος καὶ τοῦ εἴδους *Dial. 2 p. 84. 85.*

* *These words T. G. leaves out.*

For thus the Heretick disputes, 'As the Symbols of 'the body and blood of Christ are other things before the 'invocation of the Priest; but after the invocation they 'are changed, and made other, so the body of Christ 'after the assumption is changed into the divine sub'stance: and thus the *Orthodox doth answer*, 'thou art 'caught in thy own Net, for the mystical signs after San'ctification do not recede from their own natures.

Theod. Dial 2. p. 85.

Again, the Orthodox puts this question, 'are not the 'mysteries, the signs of the body which truly is, this being granted by the *Heretick, he makes this inference*, 'If 'the divine mysteries do truly represent the body, then 'the body of our Lord now is, and is not changed into 'the Deity, but only filled with his Glory. When therefore is it affirmed by *Theodoret*, that this Sacrament is τῦπος προσκυνητὸς, *a venerable Type*. And that the Symbols

Ibid. vid. p. 57.

Symbols are προσκυνητὰ, *or Symbols which are Worshiped.* This phrase can signifie no more then this, That they are venerable Types and Symbols, such as deserve a reverence or honorary Worship from all Christians, which is a very common acceptation of the word; for thus Christian Temples are stiled by the Ancients, *a* προσκυνητὰ τεμένη, or *Venerable Temples*, the *Apostles Throne*; *b* προσκυνητὸς, *a Venerable Throne*, and *Baptism*; *c* προσκυνητὸν, *or Venerable Baptism.*

a *Concil. sub Menna act.* 5.
b *Epist. Leonis* 2.
c *Justinian Novel.* 6.

The same unconscionable dealing we meet with in that passage of St. *Austin: for no Man eats Christs flesh, unless he have first adored*; for in that very place he tells us, That * *the Jews interpreted the eating of Christs Flesh*, like Fools, 'for they interpreted it carnally, whereas Christ did instruct 'his own Disciples, and say unto them, understand Spi- 'ritually what I say unto you, you shall not eat the Body 'which you see, and drink the Blood which they will 'shed that Crucifie me; I have commended unto you a 'Sacrament, that Spiritually being understood, will quicken 'you. So that *St. Austin* in this very place asserts the contradictory to what the Church of *Rome* believes touching the presence of Christs Body in the Sacrament, and calls them Fools that think Christ did intend what they imagine he hath said. Therefore it is manifest, that *St. Austin* in this place, speaks nothing of the adoration of Christs Flesh under the accidents of Bread, but only of the adoration of his Flesh considered, as united to the Godhead, and placed at the Right Hand of God.

* *In Psal.* 98. *p.* 241. F, G, H.

Lastly, to that of *Ambrose. By the Footstool, is understood the Earth, and by the Earth the flesh of Christ, which we Adore in the mysteries at this day, and which the Apostles adored in our Lord Jesus.* I answer, that he saith no more than this, that in these mysteries we Worship Christ, and consequently the flesh of Christ as being not divided from him, but he doth not say, that in adoring the mysteries we adore Christ, or that we do adore the mysteries which are Christ.

De Spir. Sancto l. 3. c. 12.

1. Therefore let it be observed, that St. *Ambrose* doth not say that we adore Christ only in this mysterie: but *in mysteriis*, or in the Celebration of the Sacraments; which it was the custome of Antiquity to do because they held these mysteries to be instituted by him, to convey unto us those blessings he had purchased by his blood, and did conceive he was invisibly present with them: and as St. * *Cyril* words it, *doth invisibly swim in the waters of Baptism.* And therefore in the Celebration of

* *in Joh.* that 9. *c.* 7.

* Paulinus Epiſt. 4. *Chryſoſt.* To. 6. in illud ſimile eſt regnum cælorum.

that rite, they call upon us as * *Captives to fall down before our King, and with hands lifted up to Heaven, to adore him, and mutually to exhort our ſelves*, and ſay, *come let us Worſhip before the Lord who made us.* And yet I hope *T. G.* will not infer that Element of Water to be tranſmuted into Chriſts Body, and therefore Worſhiped by the Chriſtians of thoſe times. Secondly, obſerve that Chriſts Sacred Fleſh being united to his Godhead, and adored with it, the Worſhip which at the celebration of thoſe Myſteries was directed to him, as ſitting in the Heavens, muſt be the Worſhip of his Fleſh; and this aſſuredly muſt be the meaning of St. *Ambroſe*, who in his expoſition of theſe words, *ſeek thoſe things which are above*, &c. ſpeaketh thus, Serm. 58. 'we ought not 'now to ſeek our Saviour upon the Earth, or according to the Fleſh, if we would find and 'touch him, but according to the Glory of his 'Divine Majeſty, that we may ſay with the 'Apoſtle *Paul, but now we know not Chriſt ac-'cording to the Fleſh.* And therefore Bleſſed *Ste-'phen* by his Faith did not ſeek Chriſt upon the 'Earth, but did acknowledge him ſtanding at the 'Right Hand of God, where, with the devotion 'of the mind he ſought him. Now this no Proteſtant denies, that Chriſt, even in the celebration of the Euchariſt, is to be Worſhiped where he is, and where he is to be ſought after by ſuch as do deſire to find him, (i.e.) *at the right hand of God.*

CHAP

CHAP. VI.

The Contents.

Prop. 1. *When we aſcribe unto the Creature the Homage due to the Creator, we become guilty of Idolatry.* Prop. 2. *To know the ſecrets of the hearts of perſons, praying at all times and in all places of the World, is a divine and incommunicated excellency.* Prop. 3. *That to aſcribe this knowledge to any Creature, to whom God doth not thus diſcover the ſecrets of the heart, and to pay that honour to it which doth ſuppoſe that knowledge, is Idolatry.* Prop. 4. *Thoſe outward Acts of Worſhip, which by conſent of Nations, or by common Uſe, do ſignifie the honour due to the Creator, are Idolatrical, when given to a Creature.* Corol. 1. *That to offer Sacrifice, is to perform that Worſhip which is proper only to God.* 2. *That to vow to Angels or to Saints departed, is to aſcribe unto them the honour due to the Creator.* 3. *Prayer offered and put up in any time and place to an inviſible and not corporeally preſent Being, is the oblation of that Worſhip to it which is due to God alone. Objections Anſwered.*

HAving thus endeavoured to confirm and juſtifie the Judgment of the Church of §. 1.

England, touching the Worshipping of the *Host*: I now proceed to shew the Equity and Justice of her Censure of the *Roman* practice, in reference unto the Invocation and Adoration of Holy Angels, and of Saints departed. And what we have to say in this particular, as the foundation of this Charge, shall be contained in these ensuing Propositions.

Prop. 1. When we ascribe unto the Creature that honour and respect, or pay unto it that Love, Praise, Confidence and Homage, which is due only to the Great Creator, we *become guilty of Idolatry*: as is apparent, 1. From the evidence of Scripture; When *Saul* had knowingly transgressed the Command of God, *Samuel* thus represents the greatness of his sin. Rebellion is חַטַּאת קֶסֶם the *sin of Magick*; *and to resist is* אָוֶן וּתְרָפִים double *Idolatry*, for both those words do signifie *Idola*; and *Teraphim* is often used for Idolatry. This then is the clear import of the words, He that doth contumaciously resist, and wilfully refuse to do what God particularly enjoyns, is virtually guilty of the sin of Magick and Idolatry: for as by consulting the Magician, or using of that wicked Art, we do ascribe that knowledge of things hid and future, to the Creature, which agrees to God alone; And as by worshipping of Idols, we put the Creature in the place of the Creator, and do impart his honour to the Idol; even so by this rebellion, and obstinate resistance of the will of Heaven, and by preferring of our wills before it, we virtually say, our wisdom ought to be preferred before his counsel, our pleasure ought to be esteemed above his will: and so we do advance our selves into the place of God, and give unto our selves that

1 Sam. 15. 23.

Ponitur pro ipso cultu Idolatrico, seu ipsa Idololatria. Kircher. concord. p. 2307.

that honour which is due to him alone, and do aſcribe unto our ſelves the higheſt wiſdom. And this we have acknowledged by the learned *Eſtius*: *They ſin*, ſaith he, *againſt this precept, Thou ſhalt have no other Gods but me, who will not yield ſubjection to God, but do contemn his precept or Authority; of which ſin* Samuel *pronounceth thus: To Rebel is as the ſin of witchcraft, and not to acquieſs is as the wickedneſs of Idolatry.* *In Sentent. l. 3 diſtinct. 33. §. 5. p. 129*

2. St. *Paul* expreſly ſaith, *That covetouſneſs is Idolatry*; and that ὁ πλεονέκτης ὅ ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης, (i. e.) *the covetous man is an Idolater*: and of the glutton he pronounceth, That *his belly is his God*; not that they properly eſteem it ſo, but that they chiefly are ſolicitous to make proviſions for it, and direct all their care and ſtudy to that end. *Id enim pro Deo habemus, cujus cauſâ omnia facimus* (ſaith *Grotius*.) And this is manifeſt from what the *Romaniſts* do comment on the firſt Commandment: For *ſeeing by this precept* (ſaith the learned *Eſtius*) *we are commanded to acknowledge God is our hope and confidence, they muſt by neceſſary conſequence offend againſt this precept, who do not place their* (utmoſt) *confidence in God, but in the fleſh*, (i. e.) *in health or riches, ſtrength or friends, or any temporal concern. And ſince this precept doth enjoyn us to love God with the higheſt love, he that by any act proceeding directly from the will, demonſtrates an equal or a greater love unto himſelf, or any other creature, than he ſhews unto God, whom he ſtands bound to love and to prefer before all other things, he muſt offend againſt this precept*, and ſo be guilty of Idolatry, by having other Gods beſides him. Col. 3. 5. Eph. 5. 5. Phil. 3. 19. *In locum.* *Loco citato.*

3. The Prophet *Habakkuk* complains of ſome who *ſacrificed to their net, and burned incenſe to their drags*, (i. e.) *they aſcribed all their victories* Hab. 1. 16.

to their own ſtrength, ſaith *Grotius*: *They attributed that to their own vertue, ſtrength and induſtry, which ſhould have been aſcribed to God.* So *Vatablus*, *They attributed to themſelves what properly belongs to God*, viz. *the good ſucceſs of their affairs. This is the Comment of the Hebrews*, ſaith the learned *Druſius*. And now by aſcribing to themſelves what properly belonged to God, they muſt be guilty of Idolatry, becauſe they do aſcribe that honour to the Creature which is due to the Creator only. And hence this ſin is repreſented as *the oblation of ſacrifice and incenſe* to a Creature, which is confeſſed to be Idolatry.

And that theſe actions do partake of the true nature of Idolatry, we have confirmed both from the evidence of Scripture, the judgment of the learned Fathers, the voice of reaſon, and the confeſſion of our Adverſaries. For when Mat. 6. 24. our Saviour ſaith, that *God* and *Mammon* cannot both be ſerved, becauſe *we cannot ſerve two Lords*, he clearly intimates, that by ſollicitude for worldly things, they become *Gods* and *Lords* unto us, and ſo we violate the precept of not having other Gods beſides him. The Fathers do expreſly ſay the like: *Let us not think*, ſaith (a) *Hom. 2. in Judic.* (a) *Origen*, *becauſe we do not worſhip Images*, *that thoſe things do not appertain to us*, *for that is God to any perſon which he prefers*, *admires*, *and loves beyond all other things. One makes his mammon*, ſaith (b) *In Rom. c. 3. Ho. 6. p. 43.* St. (b) *Chryſoſtom*, *a ſecond his luſt*, *a third his belly*, *to be his God*: *I know thou doſt not ſacrifice thy Oxen to them*, *as the Gentiles do*, *but what is far more peſtilent*, *thou offereſt up thy ſoul unto them*; *thou doſt not bend thy knee*, *nor worſhip them*, *but thou art more obedient to what thy belly and thy gold commands*, *than to the will of Heaven.* Now even reaſon

reaſon ſhews that love, hope, truſt, obedience, are parts of that internal worſhip which we owe to God in the moſt excellent degrees; and which he more regards than building Temples, and erecting Altars, than bending of the knee or body, or any other act of outward worſhip; and therefore in theſe acts doth more eſpecially conſiſt Gods worſhip: And therefore he that doth confer them upon any Creature, muſt do what is more diſtaſtful to him, than if thoſe outward Ceremonies ſhould be imparted to that Creature. The Scripture therefore doth eſteem the covetous perſon to be a worſhipper of Idols, becauſe as Heathens place their confidence in Idols, even ſo the avaritious man doth place his confidence in gold and ſilver, which are the matter of the Idols; he chiefly doth purſue them, and for their ſakes only doth other matters. And therefore what the Pagan doth unto his Idol, that doth the avaritious perſon to his gold, ſaith (c) *Chryſoſtom*; and this we have confeſſed by (d) *Eſtius*, *Aquinas*, and others of the Roman Church.

(c) Εἰπὲ μοι, τί πρὸς τὸν ἕλληνα ἐρεῖς ἀρπάζων καὶ πλεονεκτῶν· ἀπόστηθι τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας· ἄρ' ὅλως ὁ χαλάσει) καὶ ἐρεῖ, σὺ δὲ ταῦτα διαλέγου πρότερον ὁ γὰρ ὄζειν ἴσον ἕλληνα ὄντα εἰδωλολατρεῖν, καὶ χειρανὸν ὄντα τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο πεπωκέναι; πῶς γὰρ δυνησόμεθα ἕτερος ἀπάγειν τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας ἐκείνης ἑαυτοὺς τούτης οὐκ ἀπάγοντες: in Rom. c. 3. To. 6. p. 43.

(d) *Fortaſſe rectius cum S. Thoma dixeris imus, idcirco avaritiam vocari cultum Idolorum; quia ſicut Paganus in Idolo, ſic avarus in Idoli materia, quæ eſt aurum, & argentum, ſuam fiduciam collocat, ejúſque gratia omnia facit. Eſt. in loc.*

Secondly, This Propoſition may alſo be confirmed, (1.) From the definition of Idolatry; for if Idolatry conſiſts *in giving of that worſhip*

which is due to God, to that which is not God, by giving it to any Creature we must be guilty of Idolatry, it being the most clear and most unquestionable truth that the most excellent Creature is not God. 2. Whatever doth import and signifie the honour due to the Creator, doth also signifie that excellency which is only due unto him: We cannot then perform that act of honour which imports this excellency to the best of Creatures, but we must honour it as our Creator; nor can we honour it as our Creator, but we must worship it as God, and by so doing we must be guilty of what the Romanists confess to be Idolatry. 3, We may be guilty of Idolatry by paying honor to a Creature: But we can pay no greater honor to the most excellent of Creatures, than by ascribing to it that honor which is due to God alone: and therefore by ascribing of that honor to it, we must be guilty of Idolatry. 4. By giving of that honor to God which doth import that excellence and perfection which agrees to God alone, we exercise that act of Worship which we call *Latria*; for since *Dulia* doth import only the worship proper to the Creature, it cannot signifie that worship which is due to him whose dignity is infinitely greater than what the best of Creatures doth enjoy; if then we exercise that act of worship to the Creature we give *Latria* to it, and, in the judgment of our most rigid Adversaries, to give *Latria* to a Creature is to be guilty of Idolatry.

Prop. 2. §. 2. *To know the secrets of the hearts of persons praying, is a divine and uncommunicated excellency.* This is apparent 1. from expres Scripture testimony, 1 *Kings* 8. 39. 2 *Chron.* 6. 29, 30. *What prayer or what supplication soever shall be made by any man,*

man, or by all thy people Iſrael, when every one ſhall know his own ſore, and his own grief, and ſhall ſpread forth his hands in this houſe: hear thou from heaven thy dwelling place, and forgive, and render unto every man according to all his wayes, whoſe heart thou knoweſt; for thou, even thou only, knoweſt the hearts of the children of men: where firſt obſerve, That here it is aſſerted as a thing proper to God, not only that he knows the hearts of all men *collectively* taken, but *diſtributively:* (i. e.) *that he alone doth know the heart of any man:* for this is given as a reaſon why, when ſupplications are made *by any man*, God ſhould render to him according to his wayes, becauſe, he only knows his heart; (i. e.) *he only knows the heart of any ſingle perſon.* 2. Obſerve this knowledge of the heart is thus appropriated to God in reference to whatſoever prayer and ſupplication ſhall be made by any man: Whence we infer, that whatſoever prayer and ſupplication ſhall be made by any man, God only knows the heart and the conceptions of the Supplicant; and therefore that this knowledge is not communicated to Saints or Angels. 3. Obſerve, that to affirm this knowledge is aſcribed to God alone, becauſe he only hath this knowledge from the perfection of his nature; whereas it is communicated to the Saints and Angels only by way of revelation, or by the viſion of that God, who knoweth all things: Is 1. without all ground to limit what is univerſally pronounced in the caſe of prayer. 2. If we admit this limitation, to ſay *God only knows the ſecret of the heart of him that prayeth*, hath no more of truth, than if I ſhould aſſert God only hath a being, he only acts, he only knows that Chriſt is come into the world, becauſe he only

acts, and hath his being from himself; our beings and our power of action is derived from him, and by his revelation only we do know that Christ is come into the world. 3. We may on like accounts assert, That even when the general hath paid his Souldiers, he alone hath money, because what money any of his Souldiers have, was given by him; and that the Master only of the School of *Westminster* knows Greek and Latine, because his Scholars have derived that knowledge from him. 4. If we admit of such a limitation, then the exclusive term will not refer to what is spoken, but to that which is not mentioned; not to the predicate, viz. *the knowledge of the hearts of men*, which is expressed, but only to the manner of that knowledge of which the Text is wholly silent: Now this interpretation gives such a forced and strained sense, as in a matter of this nature ought not to be admitted without the greatest evidence. Whereas the sence we plead for is the most plain and natural import of the words: For it is natural to conceive the sense of this expression should be this, *thou, and no other, knowest the hearts of men*, whereas if we do paraphrase it thus, *that many myriads of Saints and Angels have this knowledge of the heart, but thou alone dost naturally know, what they receive from revelation*; this Proposition, taken as it is expressed, viz. *God only knows the hearts of men*, will be both absolutely false and uncouth, and what is contradictory to it, viz. *God only doth not know the hearts of them that pray*, will be absolutely true.

2. 2. If such a knowledge of the heart was not an uncommunicated excellency, if it was only that which did agree to many thousands of blessed Saints

Saints and Angels, then could it be no proof of the divinity of Chriſt and of the holy Spirit, for what is anſwered to the Proteſtant by thoſe who do aſcribe this knowledge to the Saints in glory, might be with equal probability alledged to baffle and evade this evidence of Chriſts divinity, which is ſo often and ſo triumphantly ſuggeſted by the holy Fathers: And hence it is confeſſed by the great (*f*) *Petavius*, that if *this knowledge were not proper to God, their argument would certainly be weak and groundleſs.* And yet the Fathers in this Argument are ſo exceeding full and copious, that it were endleſs to collect what they deliver. *Our Lord*, ſaith (*g*) *Ambroſe*, *demonſtrateth himſelf to be God, by knowing of the ſecrets of the heart. Take* (ſaith (*h*) *Chryſologus*) *theſe indications of our Lords divinity, hear how he penetrates the ſecret of thy heart, ſee how he dives into thy hidden thoughts. See*, ſaith St. (*i*) *Cyril*, *how he is that God who is the* (*k*) *ſearcher of all hearts: For to none other is it given to know the mind of man, as is apparent from that paſſage of the Pſalmiſt, God is the ſearcher of the heart and reins: for there the Pſalmiſt mentions it as a peculiar thing which only doth agree to the Divine nature, and to nothing elſe: if it be proper unto God alone to know the ſecrets of the heart; then Chriſt, who was acquainted with them, doth very well deſerve to be accounted*

(*f*) *Quod argumentum nullum eſſet omnino, ſi non Dei proprium id foret cogitationes intimas & corda cognoſcere.* Theol. dogm. Tom. 3. l. 1. c. 7. p. 39. §. 3.

(*g*) in Lucam. l. 5. c. 3.

(*h*) Serm. 50.

(*i*) p. 2. Com. in Joh. p. 144.

(*k*) Οὐδὲ μόνον ὅλα καρδιῶν ἐρεύνησις ϑεὸν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑτέρῳ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δίδωσιν ἐξετάσαι τὸν νοῦν, τὸ ἐν ἄλλοις ἐλέγχου χάριν τὸ εἶναι τὸν ἐνδυομενὸν, ἐπάζων καρδίας, καὶ νεφροὺς ὁ Θεὸς· ὡς γὰρ ἀλλοτρίου τῶν ἄλλων προσὸν μόνῃ τῇ ϑείᾳ φύσει, καὶ τοῦτο ἐξαίρεσον ὁ μαλῳδὸς ἀνατίθεικεν. *Cyril Alex. Com. in Joh. l. 2. p. 133. E.*

Εἰ γὰρ μόνῳ σωτῆρος τὰ ἐν ἡμῖν τῷ Θεῷ συνίησιν ὁ Χριστὸς· πῶς ἂν ἦσαι χριστὸς φύσιν Θεὸς ὁ τῶν κρυπτῶν γνώστης καὶ γινώσκων βαθέα, καὶ ἀπόκρυφα. *ib. p. 144.*

God.

God. So *Novatian* (*l*). In the like manner they are wont to argue and conclude the holy Spirit to be God, for *if to know the secrets of men be a propriety of God, to search the hidden things of God, as doth the holy Ghost, must be a greater demonstration of his Majesty*; so *Paschasius*. *If we especially conceive him to be God who sees the secret thoughts of man, much more is he to be esteemed God, who searcheth what is hidden in the Fathers breast*: So (*m*) *Eusebius Emissenus*. (*n*) *It is recorded of God that he doth search the heart and reins, whence it is evident that in like manner this is performed by the holy Spirit, for no inferior doth search the hidden things of his superior*: So *Ambrose. v. Petav. Theol. dogm. de Angelis, l.* 1. *c.* 7. *&* *de Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 14. It would be endless to recite all that the Fathers have delivered to this effect; if then they taught as doth the present Church of *Rome*, and practised that invocation both of Saints and Angels, which doth apparently suppose them conscious to the requests and inward motions of the heart; is it not matter of the highest admiration, and a just reason to suspect the ingenuity or common prudence of such men, who did so often urge that as an instance of Divinity which they acknowledged to agree, and by their daily practice did ascribe unto the Creature: Wherefore we are constrained, in reverence to their great names and memories, to judge they never held this knowledge was communicated to Saints and Angels, nor practised that which doth suppose it: Which will be further evident if 3ly. we consider that they affirm without distinction or exception, that to perceive the secrets of the heart is a thing proper unto God alone; this by the concurrent judgment of the Fathers being no more communicated to the Creatures

(*l*) De Trin. c. 13. p. 715.

(*m*) Hom. de Trin.

(*n*) *Quia nemo inferior superioris scrutatur interna, divinæ enim solius est potestatis occulta nosse, similiter ergo scrutatur Spiritus Sanctus ut Pater.* Ambros. de Sp. Sancto, l. 2. c. 12. f. 108. B. Col. 2. L.

Creatures than was the knowledge of what was future and contingent. *The Almighty Father only knows the hidden things* (saith * *Jerome*) alledging for the proof of this these Texts; *Thy Father that seeth in secret, &c. God searcheth the hearts and reins.* And, *Thou only knowest the hearts of all the children of men. It is the property of God alone* (saith † *Chrysostom*) *to know the secrets of the heart.* For the proof of this, besides the passages now mentioned, he adds that of *Jeremiah*, *The heart is deceitful above all things, who can know it.* And that of *Samuel*, *Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart.* And *of this*, saith he, *we have many evidences.* This he again repeats *Hom.* 24. *in Johan.* and proves it from those words of *Solomon*, *Thou only knowest the heart of man.* (o) *If thou dost thy good works in secret, wilst thou have no spectator of what is done?* (saith the same Author) *yes, thou wilst have, not indeed Angels or Arch-angels* (much less Saints and Martyrs) *but God over all.* Hence was it held a signal honor done to God, and a great act of faith to pray in silence: (p) *He that doth pray in silence*, saith St. *Ambrose*, *brings faith with him, and confesseth that God is the searcher of the heart and reins, and that he can hear his prayer before that it is uttered by his mouth.* (q) *Let us consider*, saith *Tertullian*, *the*

* Lib. 5. in Ezech. cap. 16. pag. 191. E. Mat. 6. 4. Psal. 7. 9. 1 Kings 8. 29.

† In Matt. Hom. 29. p. 201, 202. Ed. Savil. Jer. 17. 9. 1 Sam. 16. 7.

(o) οὐχὶ θεατὰς ἔχεις τῶν γινομένων πνάς; ἰδοὺ τοίνυν ἔχεις. οὐχὶ Ἀγγέλους οὐδὲ Ἀρχαγγέλους ἀλλὰ τὸν τῶν ὅλων θεόν. In Matt. Hom. 19. p. 134.

(p) *Qui in silentio orat, fidem defert, & confitetur quod Deus scrutator cordis & renis sit, & orationem tuam antè ille audiat, quàm tuo ore fundatur.* Ambros. de Sacram. l. 6. c. 4.

(q) *Consideremus benedicti cœlestem Christi Sophiam, imprimis de præcepto secretè adorandi, quo & fidem hominis exigebat, ut Dei omnipotentis & conspectum & auditum sub tectis & in abditis etiam adesse confideret, & modestum fidei desiderabat, ut quem ubique audire & videre fideret ei soli religionem suam offerret.* Tert. de Orat. c. 1. §. 8.

heavenly

heavenly wisdome of our Lord in his injunction to pray in secret, whereby he both requires the faith of man confiding that God omnipotent both hears and sees under our roofs, and in our secret places, and also that our faith be modest, so that we offer our Religion unto him alone, whom we are confident doth see and hear us every where.

Prop. 3. §. 3. *That to ascribe this knowledge to any Creature to whom God doth not thus discover the secrets of the heart: and to pay that honor to it which doth suppose such knowledge, is Idolatry.* This I make good, 1. From the confessions of our Adversaries, and from the Argument they use on like occasions. It is truly acknowledged by the Church of *Rome*, That *Magick*, *Augury*, and such like wicked Arts are sins forbidden by the first Commandment, and such as cannot be committed without gross Idolatry. Because, whoever doth expect or seek from evil Spirits, or any other Creature, what the Magician promiseth, by seeking, hoping, or expecting that from them which only ought to be expected from God, they act towards that Creature as if they thought it to be God: For instance; he that attempteth to foretell what is future and contingent, without a revelation from God, he doth unduly do it, saith the learned *Sylvius*, "for since the causes of such things are unde-
"termined, it is not possible we should attain
"to this knowledge of them from themselves,
"or from their causes, and whether we do
"speak of things contingent, or of the know-
"ledge of the conceptions of the heart, it is
"certain God alone can know them, it being
"said, *Thou only knowest the hearts of men*; and
"again, *Declare the things that are to come, that*
"*we may know that you are gods*: he therefore
"that

Catechism. Rom. part. 3. c. 1. §. 7.

2a 2æ q. 95. Art. 1.

Isa. 41. 23.

" that attempteth to foretell such things, we " therefore say that he divineth, because after " a sort he acts the God, usurping that which " only doth belong to him. 2. From the two passages of Scripture cited by him, it is evident, That albeit God sometimes did reveal unto his Prophets the knowledge of things future, and of the secrets of the heart; yet is that knowledge to be esteemed the property of God, and a sure indication of divinity, and therefore to ascribe this knowledge to a Creature, God having not revealed it to him, is to ascribe divinity unto that Creature, and to be guilty of Idolatry.

If it be said, the practice of the Church of *Rome*, however they by way of worship ascribe that knowledge to the Saints and Angels, which only doth agree to God, seems yet unduely to be charged with this crime, *because they do profess this knowledge not to be inherent in them, but to be derived from God.* I Answer, If this excuse may be admitted in this case, then must we free the Heathens, and many others from this crime, who always have been branded with it by the Church of God. For 1. The prayers and supplications which the Heathens made to their inferior Dæmons, and the first fruits and offerings which they presented to them, were only made upon this false presumption, * *That God by them dispensed earthly things, and that he had appointed them to rule over a City or a Countrey, and* || *that it was his pleasure that we should thus pray and offer*

* Δαίμοσι τοῖς τὸ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰληχόσιν εὐχαριστήτεον καὶ ἀπαρχὰς καὶ εὐχὰς ἀποδοτέον, *Celsus apud Orig. l.8. p.399. Ed. Spenc.*

|| Φησὶ δὲ καὶ τὴν θεραπεύοντα Θεοὺς πλείονας τῷ ἕν τι τῶν τοῦ μεγάλου θεραπεύειν φίλον καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἐκείνῳ ποιεῖν καὶ προστίθησιν ὅτι οὐδ' ἔξεστι τιμᾶσθαί τινι ᾧ μὴ ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦτο δέδοται, *Orig. adv. Celsum, l.8. p.381.*

offer to them; and yet both these *first fruits* and *prayers* were looked upon as pieces of Idolatry by Jews and Christians. The *Nestorians* held the Lord Christ to be a man, χάριτι θεσθέντα, by grace invested with Divinity; and if any *Arians* did ever say that Christ was to be worshipped with divine worship, they must esteem this honour to be given to him, not from the dignity of his nature, but from the pleasure of the Father, but notwithstanding they allowed him to be *Deus factus*; they were most constantly condemned by the Church of Christ, as worshippers of men, and persons guilty of Idolatry. Thus also the *Magicians* pretended to derive their knowledge of what was hidden and contingent from God, and yet they also stand condemned by the Church of Christ, and by the *Roman* Doctors, as persons guilty of Idolatry. And 4. This excuse will lay the imputation of falshood and unjust impeachment on the holy Scriptures; for nothing is more frequent in those sacred Records, than to impute to persons what their action did import, however they performed that action upon such presumptions and vain imaginations, which if they had been true, must have excused them from the imputation. The Heathens constantly professed they did not worship stocks or stones, but that spiritual Being, which by their * consecration they conceived to be present in their Images, or which those Images resembled and represented; and that profession we have recorded by

* Ὕλην μὲν φθαρτὴν εἶναι τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀφανισμὸν ὑπομένειν, δυνάμεις δὲ τίνας ἐνοικῆσαι αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀποπτῆναι, *dicit Olympius Sophista Sozom. H. Ecc. l.7. c.15. v. Dion. Chrysost. Serm.12.*

the

the† Fathers: and yet both the holy Scripture and the ancient Fathers do represent them as worshippers of wood and stone, because they vainly did conceive a Spirit to be present, when only wood and stone were there. Moreover they conceived the objects of their worship to be the great Creator, or some good Spirit, which he had appointed to act as his Vice-gerent in the world; and yet because those Spirits which they conceived to be the Minsters of God, were only Satans instruments, and most pernicious Creatures, the Scripture represents them as worshippers of Devils. The *Israelites* did not conceive the very Image they had made to be the true Jehovah, *(i. e.)* they did not think, *that gold thus formed into the Image of a Calf, had really its seat in Heaven, and did from thence behold the dwellers upon earth*; they did not really believe it was the great Creator of the World, and consequently that it made that very matter of which it was compounded, and that it performed all the wonders which their eyes had seen, before it had a being; they did not all conceive that man could at his pleasure make his Maker, or give a being to that God to whom he owes, and from whom he receives his being; and that they who were not able to preserve themselves, could make a being able to preserve the World, and to confer upon it whatever blessing could be wanting to future Ages. Nor did the Heathens, who are accused of the like crime in Scripture, entertain such

† *Hermes Ægyptius quem Trismegistum vocant — visibilia & contrectabilia simulachra velut corpora Deorum esse asserit. Inesse autem his quosdam spiritus invitatos, qui valeant aliquid, sive ad nocendum, sive ad desideria eorum nonnulla complenda, à quibus eis divini honores, & cultus obsequia deferuntur. Hos ergo spiritus invisibiles per artem quandam visibilibus rebus corporalis materiæ copulare, ut sint quasi animata illis spiritibus dicata & subdita simulachra; hoc esse dicit Deos facere. Augustin. de Civit. D. lib. 8. cap. 23. v. cap. 24.* ὅτι μὲν ἐν θεοὶ ἄψυχα ξόανα προφανὲς καὶ αὐτοῖς, *Euseb præpar. l. 4. v. Arnob. l. 6. p. 195. Lactan. l. 2. c. 2. August. in Psal. 113. Conc. 2.*

foolish

foolish thoughts. This is a truth self-evident; and writ upon the hearts and consciences of all considering men: and had I no conviction of the Idolatry committed in the Church of *Rome*, but only this, that they are forced to excuse their practice from Idolatry, by laying such prodigious imputations not only on the * Jews, but the whole † Heathen World, and to assert, they did continue such incredible portentous Sots for very many Ages; this were abundantly sufficient to justifie the Charge. For to impute to the whole World for many Ages, the belief of many things, the least of which no single person can imagine to be true, without a miracle of folly, is a triumphant demonstration that their case is desperate. For should any man be forced in defence of any Tenet to assert, that all the World did for some Ages past believe that twice two was six, or that every Ass they fed was the Creator of the World; I humbly conceive we should have reason to believe, he was some mad distempered person, and that only the badness of his cause, and his own obstinacy, and not the evidence of truth, constrained him to espouse a Tenet so reproachful to mankind. And yet this Tenet hath nothing more apparently repugnant to the sense and apprehensions of mankind, than that which is maintained by the Doctors of the *Roman* Church, *viz. That all mankind did for two thousand years conceive, that was their Maker which they had newly made, and that at pleasure they could give a being to him, who hath his being from himself, and cannot possibly receive it from another.* This therefore could not be the apprehension of the Jews and Heathens touching their Images and Calves; and yet I say, the Scripture doth expressly say, the

* *Perspicuum igitur ex Scripturis est (quicquid somniet insanum Calvini caput) Judæos simulachra pro Diis habuisse. Greg. de Valentia.*

† *Mendacium est quod Gentiles ea Deos esse non putârint. Bellarm. de Eccl. Triumph. l. 2. c. 13. s. 10. & rursus causarum quibus movebantur Ethnici ad credendum Idola esse Deos, prima est quia id eis dicebatur à Pontificibus suis, secunda, quia videbant totum ferè mundum id credere.* Ibid.

the Jews *asked counsel of their ſtocks*, and *ſaid unto the ſtock, thou art my Father, and to a ſtone, thou haſt brought me forth*; and that they *ſacrificed unto the very Idol or Image of a Calf which they had made*: and of the Heathens it affirms without diſtinction, *That they fell down and prayed to the very Image they had made*; becauſe the homage they performed to theſe Images, upon preſumption of a Deity, preſiding in them, (that being an abſurd and falſe imagination) was really performed to ſtocks and ſtones: and therefore on the ſame account this *knowledge of the heart of all, that in all places pray unto them*, being aſcribed to Saints and Angels, upon as vain preſumptions of ſuch a revelation which God vouchſafes not to them, muſt be deem'd to be the ſame, as if they did conceive this knowledge to ariſe from the perfection of their natures, and upon that account did put up their petitions to them.

Hoſ. 4. 12. Jer. 2. 27. Acts 7. 41. Eſa. 44. 15, 17.

Thoſe outward acts of worſhip, which by conſent of nations, or by common uſe and cuſtome of mankind, do ſignifie that honour they aſcribe to God alone, and by the exerciſe of which they alwayes did intend to give him the glory due unto his name, are to be reckoned acts of worſhip proper to God, and he that doth perform thoſe acts of worſhip to a Creature, which by conſent of nations have obtained to ſignifie the worſhip due to the Creator, and which in ſuch a place or country are only uſed to that intent, is by ſo doing an Idolater. For by doing of the ſame, which they conceive an act of worſhip proper to the Deity, he muſt be vertually conceived to will the ſame, and conſequently to will the giving of that worſhip to the Creature, which alone is due to the Creator. For ſeeing all ſuch actions have their import from cuſtome and inſtitution by whomſoever they are exerciſed, and whatſoever

Prop. 4. §. 4.

private apprehenſions he may have that worſhippeth, they muſt be thought to ſignifie according to that import which inſtitution and cuſtome gives them. If any man ſhould uſe thoſe words which naturally import, according to the common uſe and acceptation of the words, that hope and confidence, that love and duty which we owe to God alone, whatever private ſenſe or meaning he may put upon them in his inward thoughts, he muſt be deemed to aſcribe unto that object, to which he uſeth ſuch expreſſions, the honor due to God. For this being the immediate uſe of words to ſignifie the thoughts and apprehenſions of our hearts, he muſt be judged to uſe them in that ſenſe which cuſtome hath impoſed upon them, becauſe, they will not otherwiſe declare the apprehenſions of the mind. Since therefore outward rites & ceremonies have their ſignification from the ſame original from which our words derive it, or elſe do naturally import as much, what reaſon can be given why the uſe of words, whichdo import Gods Worſhip, ſhould be thought to ſignifie it; & yet the uſe of Rites ſhould not be thought to do the ſame: And hence S. *Auguſtine* (ſaith *Aquinas*) gives this reaſon why we muſt not ſacrifice unto inferior Dæmons (*quia exteriora ſacrificia ita ſigna ſunt interiorum, ſicut verba ſonantia ſigna ſunt rerum*) *becauſe exterior ſacrifices are ſigns of the interior, even as words are ſigns & indications of the things they ſignifie:* now ſince all outward acts of Worſhip are alſo ſigns of the interior reſpect and veneration of the ſoul, and are performed to expreſs the ſame, it follows that no act of outward Worſhip which doth by nature, cuſtome, or inſtitution, ſignifie the honour due to God, can be aſſigned to any other, without aſcribing

2ª 2æ *q.* 96. *Art.* 2.

to

to it that inward veneration which alone is due unto him: and if this vvere not ſo, thoſe vviſer heathens of vvhom St. * *Auſtin* ſpeaks, who underſtood that vvhat the vulgar people vvorſhipped vvere no Gods, and yet complyed vvith the common practice, could not be guilty of Idolatry; and they vvho underſtood them to be cheats and devils, and yet for fear of puniſhment did offer ſacrifice or incenſe to them, muſt be excuſed from that crime; becauſe they did perform indeed the outward action, but not vvith an intent to pay the inward homage vvhich vvas due to God; but only to comply vvith the opinion of the Vulgar, or to preſerve themſelves from the unhappy fate of *Socrates*; and yet St. *Auguſtine* doth pronounce thoſe vviſe men guilty in an † higher nature than they vvere, vvho thought them to be Gods; and ‖ *Thomas* gives this clear and pregnant reaſon vvhy ſuch a ſentence ſhould be paſſed upon them; *viz.* "Becauſe this outvvard Worſhip "vvas a ſign of the interior: As therefore he "that doth affirm by vvords the contrary to "vvhat his heart conceiveth, muſt be eſteemed "guilty of a pernicious lye: So alſo he that "doth exterior Worſhip to that vvhich he con-"ceiveth in his mind is no due object of that "Worſhip, is guilty of the like pernicious "falſity; vvhich ſure he could not be, if that exterior action did not import that invvard Worſhip of vvhich it is by inſtitution and by common cuſtome made the ſign: and hence in Scripture, thoſe actions which in their nature do not at all import religious Worſhip, yet being tendred to that object vvhich by thoſe actions was uſed to be vvorſhipped as God; I ſay ſuch actions are in Scripture mentioned as indi-

* *De. Civ. Dei, l. 6. c. 10.*

† *Colebat quod reprehendebat, quod culpabat adorabat--eo damnabilius quo illa quæ mendaciter agebat, ſic ageret ut eum populus veraciter agere exiſtimaret.* Aug. de Civ. Dei. l. 6. c. 10.

‖ *2a. 2æ. qu. 96. Art. 2.*

indications of Idolatry: (*viz.* to kiss the hand unto the Sun, to eat of what is sacrificed to false Gods, to feast and play before them, to bow the knee to *Baal.*) Moreover, to bow the body, or to use prostration to the wicked *Haman*, was that which *Mordecai* refused, and of this action he gives this account, *Thou knowest Lord, that it was neither in contempt, nor pride,* τὸ μὴ προσκυνεῖν, *that I refused to worship* Haman; *but I did this that I might not prefer the glory of man above the glory of God, nor will I worship any besides thee, O God.* Sith then we find this outward worship was refused, as being due to God alone; we must confess that it was due unto him, either because God hath enjoyned it should be given unto him alone, and then the Papists must confess they have Gods precept and injunction against their *prostrations* made to *Saints*, or to the *Images of Saints*; or else because this practice was in those *Persian* Countries used as a testification of Divinity, which they ascribed to their Governors, and upon that account refused not only by the *Jews* but *Greeks*, as you may see at large in *Barnaby Brissonius*: and if this reason be allowed, it clearly follows, that all religious Rites which are in any Place or Nation used customarily, as testimonies of Divinity, cannot be used in that Place or Nation, to that which is not God, without Idolatry: hence those who sate at meat in Idols Temples, however they conceived the Idol to be nothing, and so intended no such thing, are said *to drink the cup of Devils, to be partakers of the Devils table, and to have fellowship with Devils*, because those actions were in those places used to signifie the worship of those Heathen Gods which mostly were not Gods, but Devils. Lastly,

Esth. 13. 14.

De Regno Persico, l. 1. *p.* 8, 15.

1 Cor. 10. 20, 21.

ly, ſhould any perſon put the Crown upon a Subjects head, and the Sword into his hand, ſhould he proclaim him King, and do whatever elſe was wont to ſignifie, and to confer the Royal dignity; would not that perſon juſtly be eſteemed guilty of Rebellion; and of aſcribing to the Subject what was due only to the King? though he ſhould frequently proteſt that by ſo doing he intended no ſuch thing, but only to do honor to the King, by giving it unto his Subject; and that all this honor which he gave unto the Subject, was only *Relative*, and *tranſient*, and *propter principem*, or for the greater honor of that *Prince* whoſe Miniſter he was, whereas the honor conferred upon the King by the like actions, was abſolute and terminated on himſelf. If all theſe ſubtilties and quirks of wit would not excuſe this perſon from Rebellion, I fear they will as little juſtifie the *Papiſts* in uſing of thoſe Rites to *Images*, and *Crucifixes*, and paying their devotions to *Saints* and *Angels* in thoſe expreſſions, which in the common acceptation of them, aſcribe unto thoſe Creatures the power of conferring what God alone can give. Now from this propoſition do ariſe theſe Corollaries.

That to offer Sacrifice, is to perform that Worſhip which is proper only to God: For *T. G.* truly doth aver, That *Sacrifice is not only by the cuſtom of the Church, but all mankind, appropriated to ſignifie the abſolute Worſhip due only to God*; and this St. *Auſtin* did conceive to be the common apprehenſion of mankind. Hence he expreſly ſaith, *That no man certainly dares* * *ſay that deberi niſi Domino ſoli — quia verè ſacrificandum cenſuit niſi ei quem Deum, aut ſcivit, aut putavit, aut finxit.* Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 10. c. 4.

Corol. 1. §. 5. p. 389.

* *Sacrificium certè nullus eſt qui audeat dicere*

Sacrifice belongs to any but to God alone, and puts this Queſtion, *Who ever thought that he ſhould ſacrifice to any perſon whom he did not know, or feign, or think to be God.* And this is evident from
Ex.22.20. Scripture, which doth expreſly ſay, *He that ſacrificeth to the Gods, ſhall utterly be deſtroyed, except unto Jehovah, even unto him only.* And therefore when *Manoah* would have detained the Angel with him, that he might prepare for him a
Jud.13.16 Kid, the Angel anſwered, *If thou intendeſt to prepare a Sacrifice, it muſt be offered unto God.* When the men of *Lyſtra* aſſayed to ſacrifice to *Paul* and *Barnabas*, they rent their cloaths, and preſently ran in among the people, crying out, that they were men; this being in the judgment of
Act.14.14 St. *Paul* and *Barnabas*, as well as of St. *Auſtin*, to *perform the Worſhip proper to a Deity.* But here
P. 392. *T. G.* aſſures us, That *it is far from the hearts of Roman Catholicks, when they ſpeak of Sacrifice, as proper to God, to think that this is meant of external Sacrifice, as diſtinguiſhed from prayer.* Now here I cannot but admire at the groſs ignorance of this Aſſertion, which doth abundantly diſcover, that *T. G.* neither knows what is the import of a Sacrifice, nor what *the Church of Rome* aſſerts concerning it. For Sacrifice doth neither in the nature of the thing, nor in the judgment of the *Romiſh* Church, include a prayer, that is by them aſſerted *to be* (*a*) *another kind of Worſhip*, but Sacrifice as it denotes the outward action, is (*b*) *the oblation of ſomething ſenſible*, and this is that, ſay they, which is *the* (*c*)

(*a*) *In oblatione Sacrificii cujuſcunque ſacerdotis duo poſſunt conſiderari, ſc. ipſum Sacrificium oblatum, & devotio offerentis.* Aquinas 3. *part. q.* 22. *Art.* 4.

(*b*) *Sacrificium eſt oblatio rei ſenſibilis — ſoli Deo facta per realem mutationem ad teſtandum ſupremum illius Dominium & noſtram ſubjectionem.* Becan. *Theol. Scholaſt. part.* 3. *c.* 25. *q.* 2.

(*c*) *Dicitur rei ſenſibili, ut excludatur interna oblatio, quâ quis ſeipſum & ſua omnia Deo ſubjicit & offert, quod non eſt propriè Sacrificium.* Ib. *Dicitur quarto ſoli Deo facta, quia Sacrificium propriè pertinet ad cultum Latriæ qui ſoli Deo exhiberi poteſt.* Ib.

proper

proper Sacrifice. But ſeeing this oblation doth alſo ſignifie the inward conſecration, or the oblation of our ſelves to God, it therefore is to *be eſteemed, ſay they, a Worſhip due to God alone.* And whereas *T. G.* tells us, That *this oblation contains the higheſt act of prayer*, it is apparent that it is no prayer, for it is no petition which yet is made the Genus, and put into the definition of a prayer, both by the (*d*) *Schoolmen* and the *Fathers*: And I would gladly know what that man prays for, who only ſaith, *Oh Lord, I offer up my ſoul and body to thy ſervice.* Sith therefore nothing more is requiſite to the internal Sacrifice, it is extreamly evident that prayer is no neceſſary part or adjunct of it. Prayer may indeed be uſed with Sacrifice internal and external, and Sacrifice with prayer; but if that be ſufficient to demonſtrate that prayer is a part of Sacrifice, our Hoods and Surplices muſt be a part of Common prayer, becauſe we uſe them with it. Moreover it is evident, that when the *Romaniſts* aſſert that Sacrifice is proper to God, they mean as well the (*e*) *outward* as the *inward Sacrifice*; for that Sacrifice which they confeſs to be *Latria*, is *the oblation of ſomewhat ſenſible*, of (*f*) *ſomething that doth ſignifie the inward Sacrifice*, and *ſuffereth a real change.* Now all theſe things can only be aſſerted of the outward Sacrifice; that therefore in the judgment of the *Roman Catholick* is properly *Latria*, or that Worſhip which is due

p. 391. *Adorationem ſecundo requiritur petitio.*

(*d*) Aqui. 2. 2æ. qu. 84 *Art.* 17

(*e*) *Imagini non convenit cultus internus verus Latriæ, nec externus proprius, qualis eſt Sacrificium* Bellar. *l.* 2. *de Imaginibus, c.* 24.

Corporale Sacrificium ad Latriam pertinet. Alex. Halenſis *part.* 4. *de Orat. qu.* 26. *Art.* 5. *p.* 704.

(*f*) *Significat autem Sacrificium quod offertur exterius, interius ſpirituale Sacrificium, quo anima ſeipſam offert Deo — & ideo ſicut ſoli Deo ſummo debemus Sacrificium ſpirituale offerre, ita etiam ſoli Deo debemus offerre exteriora Sacrificia.* Aquin. 2a 2æ. *qu.* 89. *Art.* 2.

to God alone: Which I will further prove
Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 10. c. 19. 1. From *Aquinas* and St. *Austin*, who do argue thus; "the outward Sacrifice doth signifie the "inward and spiritual Sacrifice, and therefore "seeing the inward and spiritual Sacrifice must "be presented only to the highest God, the "outward also must be offered only to him.
2. I ask if this external Sacrifice be not the worship proper to God, whether or no it be Idolatry to offer it to Saints and Angels, or to Heathen Emperors and Dæmons: if it be not, why did the ancient Christians refuse to do it upon this account. Why was it alwayes deemed Idolatry even to cast a little (*g*) Incense upon the Altar of an Heathen Deity? but if it be Idolatry to give this outward worship to a Creature; it must be only due to the Creator, as is apparent from what we have discoursed touching the nature and definition of Idolatry.

(g) *Non est tantum in eo servitus Idoli, si quis duobus digitulis thura in buſlum aræ jaciat.* Hieron. ep. ad Heliodorum.

Corol. 2. §. 6. *To vow to Angels or to Saints departed, is to ascribe unto them the honour due to the Creator.* For before this Superstition of the Church of *Rome* obtained, whoever offered up a vow to an invisible Being, but he conceived or feigned it to be God? Wherefore this worship, when it began to be thus used by the Roman party, was by the common practise and consent of Nations made to signifie the worship only due to God, and so their practise, who do ascribe this worship to the Saints departed, must be deemed Idolatry, because it is the giving of that worship to them which is due to God: and this in *Thesi* is confessed by the Roman Catholick: to (*h*) *vow is to perform the worship of Latria*, say the Schoolmen,

(h) *Vovere est propriè actus Latriæ.* Aquin. 2ª 2ª q 88. Art. 5.

Schoolmen. They put God into the (*i*) definition of a Vow, and tell us that *it is a* (k) *promiſe made to God*; and that *it* (l) *only differs from a promiſe made to man in this reſpect, that it is made to God.* It is confeſſed by *Bellarmine*, that *in the holy Scriptures we have no inſtance of a Vow that was not made to God alone.* *Aquinas* * proves a Vow to be *the worſhip of Latria*, becauſe the Prophet † *Eſa* ſaith of the Ægyptians, *they ſhall do ſacrifice and oblation, yea, they ſhall vow a Vow unto the Lord, and perform it*; for *to worſhip God*, ſaith he (to wit, with Sacrifice and Oblation) *is Latria, therefore to vow unto him muſt be ſo:* and this conceſſion of our Adverſaries, may farther be confirmed by Reaſon and Authority. For we do virtually aſcribe unto thoſe perſons to whom our Vows are made, the knowledge of thoſe Vows, and of the diſpoſition of the heart whence they proceed; for otherwiſe we muſt ſuppoſe them equally inclined to aſſiſt the hypocritical and the ſincereſt Votary; and if we do ſuppoſe them ignorant of what we vow, our worſhip muſt be vain and fruitleſs: now hence it follows that we muſt pay this worſhip to him only who underſtandeth what we vow, and is acquainted with the inward motions of the ſoul, which only God, who is the *ſearcher of the heart*, doth know. Beſides, the Romaniſt doth often vow that his (*m*) whole life ſhall be devoted to the bleſſed Virgin, or ſome other Saint. Now in the judgment of St. *Auſtin*, thus *to* (*n*) *conſecrate* (*m*) I humbly

(*i*) *Eſt igitur votum promiſſio deliberata boni cujuſpiam meliorîs Deo facta; per hoc quod additum eſt* Deo facta, *diſtinguitur votum à promiſſione quæ fit homini.* Eſtius in ſent. l. 4. diſt. 38. §. 1. p. 206. 207.

(*k*) *Votum eſt quædam promiſſio Deo facta.* ibid.

(*l*) *Votum ſoli Deo fit, ſed promiſſio etiam poteſt fieri homini.* id.

* ibid.

† ch. 19. 21.

beg of thee, oh Mother of all Clemency, that thou wouldſt vouchſafe to admit me into the number of thoſe who have devoted themſelves to thee, to be thy perpetual ſervants. *Reflect. on the Devotion of the Romiſh Church*, p. 420.

(*n*) *Ut ſacra faciemus & ſacrificemus vel aliqua noſtra, ſive nos ipſos religionis ritibus conſecremus, hic eſt Divinitati, vel ſi expreſſius dicendum eſt Deitati debitus cultus.* Aug. de Civ. Dei. l. 10. c. 1.

our

our ſelves by a religious rite to any thing, is to perform unto it the worſhip proper to a Deity.

Cor. 3. §. 7. *Prayer offered and put up in any time and place to an inviſible, and not corporeally preſent being, is the oblation of that worſhip to it which is due to God.* For this, before the Superſtition of the *Romiſh Church* prevailed, was alwayes uſed as an indication of Divinity, and a thing proper to the *Deity*. Thus *Dio* tells us that *Caligula* was worſhipped as a God, becauſe they offered to him ἱκεσίας καὶ εὐχὰς, prayers and ſupplications. The conſecration of an Image was deemed by ſome Heathens, to fix within it ſome inviſible and powerful being, and then by ſupplication to the conſecrated Image it was made a God, according unto that of *Martial:*

L. 8. Ep. 24 *Qui fingit ſacros auro, vel marmore vultus*
Non facit ille Deos, qui Rogat ille facit.

'Tis not the carved Gold, or Marble ſtone
That makes the God, but Supplication.

* *Ecce ornatur conſecratur oratur tum poſtremo Deus eſt.* p. 26. *It is adorned,* ſaith * *Minutius, and conſecrated, and laſtly it is prayed unto, and then it is a God:* This may be farther proved from Scripture, Reaſon, and Authority: From Scripture thus; He only ought to be the object of our Prayer who is our Heavenly Father; for thus the Precept runs, ὅταν προσεύχησθε λέγετε, *when, or as often as you pray, ſay, Our Father, &c.* which Precept muſt not be ſuppoſed to enjoyn all Chriſtians to uſe theſe words whenſoever they do pray, for we do never find in any of the prayers which the Apoſtles made, that they did ſo; it therefore doth enjoyn us when we pray for any thing which in this Prayer is mentioned or contained,

Luk. 11. 2.

contained, to pray unto our heavenly Father for it. 2. Obſ. This form of Prayer muſt be ſuppoſed to contain all things which are the matter of a true and grateful Prayer, according unto that of *Auſtin* †, *Run through all the words of holy Prayers, and you will be able to find nothing which is not included in the Lords Prayer*: in this both Proteſtants and Roman Catholicks agree. Hence therefore I aſſume, if when we pray for any thing contained in this Prayer, we are enjoyned to pray to God, then all our acceptable Prayers muſt be directed to him, and whenſoever we do pray for any bleſſing, we muſt call upon him: beſides, *Our Father* doth belong to every Petition, no other perſon being mentioned in this Prayer; ſo that the ſenſe runs thus, *Our Father, &c.* let *thy Kingdome come. Our Father*, let *thy will be done, &c.* And then the import of this injunction will be this, when you pray for the advancement of Gods Glory, or the promotion of his Kingdom, or the performance of his Will; when you ſolicite for any Temporal bleſſing, or for the pardon of your Sin; or laſtly, for the prevention of any Evil, or Temptation of what kind ſoever; when you deſire any of theſe mercies for your ſelves or others, pray to your Heavenly Father for them. 3. None of theſe bleſſings muſt be asked of him to whom the Kingdom, Power, and Glory doth not of right belong. For this is added as the cauſe or motive of making theſe addreſſes to God, and where the motive or cauſe is wanting, the effect muſt ceaſe: Now to God only the *Kingdome*, *Power*, and *Glory* doth agree, *Jude* 25. We therefore muſt addreſs our Prayers to him only for the obtaining of theſe bleſſings: And leaſt you ſhould object that this Argument

† *Dicendum quod oratio Dominica perfectiſſima eſt, quia ſicut Auguſtinus dicit ad Probum, ſi rectè & congruenter oramus nihil aliud dicere poſſumus quam quod in iſta oratione Dominica poſitum eſt.* Aquinas 2. 2æ q. 83. Art. 9. Ep. 121. c. 12.

Argument excludes the third and ſecond perſons of the Sacred Trinity; let it be noted that all the *Schoolmen* do affirm, That *the word Father in this Prayer muſt not be taken perſonally, but eſſentially, and ſo excludeth not the other Perſons of the Trinity, but thoſe things only which have not the ſame nature with them.* 2. Prayer offered up in any time or place to an inviſible, and for any thing we know, a Being abſent from us as far as Earth from Heaven, doth aſcribe unto that Being the knowledge of the ſecrets of the heart: now to worſhip any Being, whether Saint or Angel, with ſuch a kind of worſhip which doth aſcribe unto it the knowledge of the deſires and ſecrets of the heart, both where and whenſoever they are conceived or uttered, is to aſcribe unto them by way of worſhip what is not due to Saints or Angels, but alone to God, as hath been proved already, and may be further thus confirmed. (1.) If Saints departed were acquainted with the deſires of our hearts, why did *Elijah* ſpeak unto *Eliſha* thus, *Ask what thou wilt before I am taken from thee?* The Scripture doth affirm that he was taken up into the Heavens, and therefore did behold the face of God. And *Roman Catholicks* themſelves deny that he was held in *Limbo*, as they imagine other Prophets were: being in Heaven, his love unto *Eliſha* and the Church of God was not diminiſhed, but enlarged, and therefore upon that account he had a ſtronger reaſon to ask what he deſired then before. Beſides, the Prophet being now with God in Heaven, his Prayers would more effectually prevail for any Bleſſing for his Friend: and therefore he had greater reaſon to have ſaid, had he believed this Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, *Ask what thou wilt*

2 Kings 2. 9.

wilst when I am taken from thee. And therefore we have reason to presume, that he did not believe this Doctrine, but rather thought that his departure would render all *Elijah*'s future wishes and addresses to him vain and ineffectual. (2.) From that known passage of *Isaiah*, *Abraham nescivit nos, & Israel ignoravit nos.* St. *Augustine* thus concludes (o), *If such great Patriarchs were ignorant of what was done towards the people that proceeded from their Loins, how should the dead be conversant in knowing or helping of their friends in what they do? There therefore are the Spirits of dead persons where they do not see what things are done or happen to men in this life.*

(o) *Si tanti Patriarchæ quid erga populum ex his procreatum ageretur ignoraverunt, quibus Deo credentibus populus ipse ex eorum stirpe promissus est, quomodo mortui suorum rebus atque actibus cognoscendis adjuvandisque misceantur?—ibi ergo sunt spiritus defunctorum, ubi non vident quæcunque aguntur aut eveniunt in ista vita hominibus.* De curâ pro mortuis. c. 13.

2. I reason thus, this practice doth ascribe unto the objects of our Prayer such knowledge of the heart, and such a cognisance of all petitions presented to them at all times, and in all places of the world, which we have proved to agree to God alone, or such a presence in all places which is proper to him, and therefore it ascribeth to them the honor due to God alone.

2. If Saints departed do know the minds and inward thoughts of those who put up their petitions to them, they have this knowledge either from Revelation, or from the beatifick Vision; but they have no such knowledge either from Revelation, or from the Beatifick Vision. *Ergo.* And

1. God doth not ordinarily reveal unto them the knowledge of the hearts of their petitioners: For if they do not want this Revelation,

God,

God, who doth nothing vainly, must not be supposed to impart it. But these blessed Spirits do not want it; for did they need this Revelation to perceive our minds (saith *Bellarmine*) the Church would not so confidently say to all the Saints, pray for me, (much less we offer to you the desires of our hearts) but sometimes would desire God, thus to reveal our prayers, and to acquaint them with the desires of our hearts.

Votis precamur, cordium audite preces supplicum. Brev. in Com. Apost. p. 2.

2. If God thus reveal the Prayers of the Petitioner to the deceased Saints, what reason can be given (saith the forementioned Author) why all the holy *Patriarchs* and *Prophets* were not invoked by the Church of *Israel* before our Saviours advent? and he had reason to make this enquiry. For (1.) It is as easie to Almighty God to make this Revelation to the souls in *Limbo* (that Papal prison of the *Antient Patriarchs* and holy *Prophets*) as to the souls in Heaven, nor have we one example or declaration, that what God is supposed now to do, he was not willing to do then. (2.) Certain it is, the charity of those departed *Patriarchs* and *Prophets* towards their relatives and friends, and the whole Church of God, must be exceedingly advanced by their change, they must be more the friends of God, and their petitions must be more prevailing, then whilst they did continue in the flesh: Wherefore the *Jews* had as good reason to invoke these *Patriarchs* and *Prophets*, as hath the *Romanist* to call upon the *Christian Martyrs*. And God had equal reason to declare this was the duty of the *Jew*, and to reveal their Supplications to the *Patriarchs*, as to declare this was the duty of the *Christian*, and to reveal their Supplications to departed *Christians*.

ſtians. (3.) What a ridiculous office do they impoſe upon the God of Heaven by this fond opinion? for when they pray to *Apollonia* for the tooth-ach. God muſt not only tell her that ſuch a perſon ſupplicates, but alſo that his teeth do ake, and therefore he particularly imploreth her aſſiſtance, when they addreſs themſelves to any Saint in this odd language, * *Our Father which art in heaven, &c.* which they familiarly do, as is acknowledged by the *Roman Catechiſm.* God muſt inform this Saint both of the perſon praying, and his prayer, and his intention by ſo doing, to oblige him to uſe thoſe words in his behalf. † When they deſire any Saint or Angel to go unto the Bleſſed Virgin, this Saint muſt be informed firſt of the matter of the Prayer, then muſt he poſt unto the bleſſed Virgin, and ſhe muſt go unto her Son, and he unto his Father to preſent that requeſt which he revealed. And are not theſe men very bold with God, to put ſuch offices upon him, and make him Nuntio to all his Creatures?

2. The Saints departed do not know the hearts and the petitions of their Supplicants, by vertue of the beatifick Viſion. This vain preſumption depends on this, that ſeeing God, they muſt in him behold thoſe things which in Idea are contained in him, or which his knowledge doth perceive, and ſo the refutation of this dream will be ſufficient confutation of it. And (1.) That which the holy Spirit only knows, theſe bleſſed Spirits do not know; but *the things of God* (*i. e.* his purpoſes and counſels, *&c.*) *knoweth no man but the Spirit of God*, 1 Cor. 2.11. *Ergo.* If then the bleſſed Spirits, notwithſtanding the beatifick Viſion, do not ſee the mind and counſel of God without his revelation,

* *Cum ad Imaginem Sancti alicujus quis Dominicam orationem pronuntiat, ita tum ſentiat ſe ab illo petere, ut ſecum oret ſibiq; poſtulet ea quæ Dominicæ orationis formulâ continentur.* Catech. Rom. *part* 4. *c.* 6. *ſ.* 4. *p.* 586.

† *O præco accelera piæ matris præcare viſcera.* Propr. Feſt. F. 2.

on, why should we think that by beholding of God, they also do behold the supplications we put up unto them? Those words of *Prosper*, *That nothing is so secret, as that the knowledge of it should be denied to the perfectly blessed*: And that of *Gregory*, *That they who see that God who seeth all things, must themselves see all things.* I say, those words do as much prove that blessed Spirits do know the secrets of Gods counsel, as that they see the supplications we put up unto them. To strengthen and confirm this Argument, let us consider, (1.) That the Fathers do from this place conclude the holy Spirit to be God, because he is the searcher of the things of God; which Argument would be invalid, if this could truly be asserted of the blessed Spirits. 2. Observe that the Apostle argues thus, That *as no man knows the secrets of the heart of man, besides the Spirit of man within him*, so none can know the secrets of the God of Heaven, *but the Spirit of God.* Now if the blessed Spirits do know the secrets of the heart of man, the Argument would be invalid; for the *Romanist* might give the baffle to St. *Paul*, and tell him, That as the secrets of the heart of man are known not only to the Spirit of man, but also to myriads of blessed Saints and Angels, so may the secrets of God be known not only to the holy Spirit, but to many others. 2. The Scripture doth assure us, That those blessed Angels which always did behold the face of God, had not the knowledge of those things which are revealed to us by the Gospel; and that the curious Wisdom which contrived that dispensation, was *made known unto them by the Church*: and therefore *Peter* represents them, as *stooping down* to view this new discovery; which is a signal

De vita Contemp. l.5.c.4.

L.12. Moral. c.13.

1 Cor.2.12

Eph.3.10. 1 Pet. 1. 12

ſignal indication of the falſhood of this fond conceit. That bleſſed Spirits ſeeing him who knoweth all things, muſt have the knowledge of thoſe things he ſees, and therefore of the prayers that are put up unto him, they being ſeen and known to God. (3.) That we may pray in faith, we muſt be certain that the bleſſed Spirits are acquainted with the deſires of our hearts; for he that doth command us to pray in faith, and without doubting, cannot be wanting to give us certain motives of this faith: and therefore God, who never is deficient in what is neceſſary, would certainly have given both to *Jews* and *Chriſtians* ſufficient revelation of his will in this particular, had he intended that they ſhould pay this homage to the Saints departed; whereas we have no certain evidence, that they enjoy this knowledge, either from Revelation, or from Viſion. And (1.) We are not certain that they behold our ſupplications in the beatifick Viſion; for many of the Church of *Rome* do hold the contrary, and it is free for all her members ſo to do, and ſo this matter cannot be held as any Article of faith, or certain definition of the Church. 2. It is not certain that theſe bleſſed Spirits by vertue of this Viſion do behold what is contingent, for this is generally denied by the *Romiſh* Doctors, and yet theſe things are ſeen of God as clearly as are the ſecrets of the heart. (2.) We cannot poſſibly be certain that God doth reveal them; for we cannot certainly conclude it from his Attributes, nor have we any certain revelation that he doth reveal our minds and thoughts unto them: for if we can certainly conclude it from his Attributes, then God would not be God, did he not thus reveal our

ſupplications to the Saints departed. And Secondly, Then to deny this Revelation, would be to ſin againſt the light of nature; and then not only *Proteſtants*, but the prevailing part of *Roman Catholicks*, muſt ſin againſt the light of nature, by holding they obtain this knowledge, not by Revelation, but from the Viſion of that God who knoweth all things: but if by vertue of ſome Revelation, we are aſſured that our petitions are revealed to the Saints, why do they not produce it? Why doth *T. G.* confeſs, that *Auſtin* and others of the ancient Fathers, were uncertain what to determine in this caſe? Why do the greater part of *Roman Catholicks* deny what they have certain Revelation for? 3. Where is this Revelation to be found? In Scripture? No, they confeſs that this is wholly ſilent in this matter, and give us many Reaſons why it was not mentioned in holy Writ. Have we this Revelation from Tradition? Why then do the prevailing part of *Roman Catholicks* reject it? Sith then we have no certainty of what this practice doth ſuppoſe, either from Revelation, or from the beatifick Viſion, we muſt be guilty of Idolatry, by our compliance with this practice.

3. That this is the concurrent judgment of the Fathers, and that they judged all ſupplications to inviſible and abſent Beings to attribute Gods Worſhip to them, may be evinced from two Conſiderations: 1. That they look'd upon it not only as a Sacrifice, but as the beſt and greateſt Sacrifice. *By prayer we honour God,* ſaith *Clemens*, *and ſend up to him,* θυσίαν ἀρίστην καὶ ἁγιωτάτην, *the beſt and the moſt holy Sacrifice: I offer to him a fairer and a better Sacrifice than he himſelf enjoyned, viz. Prayer iſſuing from a chaſt body,*

Strom. l. 7. p. 717. A. Apol. c. 30. p. 27. B.

an

an unspotted soul, and inspired by the Holy Ghost, so *Tertullian*. And this is verily St. *Austin*'s judgment, in that place which Dr. *Stillingfleet* had cited to this effect, and all the tragedies and outeries of *T. G.* against him upon this occasion, are the most false and impudent that ever drop'd from Pen? To make this clear, it will be needful only to lay before the Reader *Austin*'s words, *viz.* *Qui autem putant haec visibilia Sacrificia Diis aliis congruere, illi vero tanquam invisibili invisibilia, & majori majora, melioriq; meliora, qualia sunt pura mentis & bona voluntatis officia, profecto nesciunt haec ita esse signa illorum, sicut verba signantia vel sonantia sunt rerum, quocirca sicut orantes atque laudantes ad eum dirigimus significantes voces cui res ipsas in corde quas significamus offerimus, ita sacrificantes non alteri visibile Sacrificium offerendum esse noverimus, quam illi, cujus invisibile Sacrificium nos ipsi esse debemus*: i. e. They that conceive these visible Sacrifices may agree to lesser Gods, but that to him who is invisible, the greater and the better God, invisible, greater and better Sacrifices do agree, *viz.* the duties of a pure mind, and a good will; these persons know not that these (outward Sacrifices) are the signs of them, (*viz.* of the invisible, the greater and the better Sacrifices) as our words spoken are the signs of things; as therefore when we pray or we give thanks, we direct our speech to him, *N. B.* to whom we offer the conceptions of the heart they signifie; so when we sacrifice, we know the outward Sacrifice ought to be offered unto him alone, to whom we ought to yield our selves a Sacrifice invisible. Where 1. Doth not St. *Austin* say, That *the invisible Sacrifices are greater and better than the outward Sacrifice*; for what is it *illorum* can refer *De C. D. l.* 10. *c.* 19.

to, beſides *majorum* and *meliorum*? Doth not he ſay, *The duties of a pure mind* and *a good will are* to be deemed *inviſible* and *better Sacrifices*? And is not Prayer the duty of a pure mind and a good will? And muſt he not then ſay, that Prayer is a greater and a better offering than any outward Sacrifice? And 2. To put the matter beyond all diſpute, doth not St. *Auſtin* add, *That theſe inferior Spirits who uſurp Divinity require Sacrifices, not that they are delighted with the ſmoak and vapour, but with the mind of him that prayeth*? clearly concluding that to be the better and the higher ſervice. Doth not he intimate that they uſurp Divinity more by requiring Prayer than Sacrifice? And laſtly, Doth not he affirm, That they who offer outward Sacrifice to him alone, to whom their inward ought to be appropriated, do alſo *when* (i. e. as often as) *they pray* or *render thanks, direct their words* (not to a Saint or Angel, but) *to him to whom they offer the things conceived in the heart*? Which doth not only prove, That Prayer was by him likened to Sacrifice; and that mental Prayer which the *Trent Council* will not permit us to deny to Saints, is an inviſible and higher Worſhip than the outward Sacrifice, but alſo that the Chriſtians of his time did pray and render thanks to God alone; for elſe it had been obvious to reply to the ſimilitude St. *Auſtin* gives us, *That as we ſometimes offer up our prayers and our thankſgivings to the Saints departed, ſo might we offer up the outward Sacrifice.* And this will be ſufficient to demonſtrate, That *T. G.* in his whole Anſwer to this place, hath not one word of truth. For 1. It is a falſe ſuggeſtion, that *Auſtin's* Argument runs thus, That *external Sacrifice being the higheſt expreſſion of the higheſt part of Prayer, ought*

Qui ergo Divinitutem ſibi arrogant Spiritus, non cujuſlibet corporis fumo, ſed ſupplicantis animo delectantur.

P. 391.

ought of all others to be reserved, as most proper to God. For his Argument is clearly this, *To him only do belong the signs to whom belongeth what is represented by them, and therefore seeing we must offer up our selves to God alone, that outward Sacrifice which is the sign of this oblation, must be appropriated to him.* That outward Sacrifice is the highest expression of the highest part of Prayer, St. *Austin* doth not say. 2. It is a false insinuation, that when St. *Austin* doth deny, that Sacrifice is due to any other but the highest God, *he doth not speak of Sacrifice distinguished from Prayer*, for he styles it *Sacrificium visibile*; he doth oppose it to the duties of a pure mind, as the less unto the greater; he represents it as the sign of the invisible; and therefore it is plain stupidity to think, he did not speak of the external Sacrifice, as different from the internal, or distinguished from it. 3. It is prodigiously false that Dr. *St.* sides with the * Heathens against *Austin* for what the Dr. pleads for; *viz.* That *Prayer was to be deemed an higher act of worship, than the outward Sacrifice*, St. *Austin* doth expressly grant. 4 It is as false that *Austin* doth confute what Dr. *St.* approved, for *Austin* only doth confute this Tenet, *That outward Sacrifice might be imparted to inferior Spirits.* That which the Doctor doth approve, is this, That in all reason the duty of Prayer ought to be reserved as more proper to God than any external Sacrifice. And lastly, it is false that *Austin* doth deny what Dr. *St.* asserted, for he abundantly confirms it; but it is no wonder that persons given up by Gods just judgment to believe a lye, should be so prone to tell them.

2. The Fathers, when they lay down the definition or description of Prayer, they always do

* Dr. *St.* is forced to maintain an Argument of the Heathens against *Austin. T. G. p.* 390. Do you not think the Dr. used the utmost of his confidence to maintain for very good an Argument of the Heathens confured by St. *Austin* in this very place. The Heathen, saith Dr. *St.* argued very well, I deny it, saith St. *Austin. T. G. p.* 390

it with expreſs reference to God, whence we may rationally conclude, that they conceived this act of Worſhip did properly belong to him: *Prayer*, ſaith St. *Clemens*, *is a converſing with God*: † *Prayer is a requeſt of ſome good thing which is made by pious men to God*, ſaith *Baſil*, whence elſewhere he aſſerts, that *Prayer is not directed unto man, but God.* ‖ *Prayer is a conference with God*, ſaith *Nyſſen*, *and a requeſt of good things which is offered with ſupplication unto God. Prayer is a Colloquy with God, and every one that prays, diſcourſeth with God*; ſo St. * *Chryſoſtome*: Hence on that expreſſion of St. *Paul*, *with all that call upon the name of the Lord*, he notes, ὑ τῷ Κύριῳ ἢ τῷ δεῖνι, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὄνομα τῦ μόνου, that *St. Paul doth not ſay, that call on this or that*, i. e. *of any thing but Chriſt*: and on theſe words, *Do all in the name of the Lord Jeſus*, he comments thus; *i. e. do all things, praying unto him for help; and before all thy buſineſs, making thy ſupplication to him*: or he ſaith thus; *ſay and do all things* κατὰ Θεὸν, *to, or according to God, and introduce not Angels.* But *T. G.* hath ſome Arguments to prove that Saints and Angels have the knowledge of our hearts and actions; *viz.*

† Προσευχὴ ἐστὶν αἴτησις ἀγαθῦ παρὰ ὁσίων ἀνθρώπων. *Baſil. Tom. 1. Orat. in Julitt. Martyr. p. 318.*

‖ Προσευχὴ ἐστὶν αἴτησις ἀγαθῶν μετὰ ἱκετείας πρόσωπον τῷ Θεῷ. *Greg. Nyſſ. de Orat. Dom. or. 2. p. 724. D.*

* Τίς ἐστιν ἡ καλὴ βουλὴ τῶν πάντων, ἢ αὐτῷ ἀνήκουσα ἄπτου τῶν πραγμάτων — ἢ ἵνα τοῦτο μόνον καὶ κατὰ Θεὸν πάντα ἢ λέγητε ἢ πράττητε μὴ τοὺς Ἀγγέλους εἰσάγητε. *Chryſoſt. in Gen. Hom. 30. Chryſoſt. Tom. 4. p. 139.*

Object. *T. G. p. 419.* It is ſaid *Luke* 15. 7. *There ſhall be joy in Heaven*; and *v.* 10. *There ſhall be joy before the Angels of God, upon one ſinner that doth penance.* And the Saints in Heaven no doubt rejoyce as much at the converſion of a ſinner, as the Angels do.

"Not

"Not only the Angels of God, but holy men on earth rejoyce at the converſion of a "ſinner, *Luke* 15.24. 2 *Cor.*7.9. Likewiſe Parents, Miniſters, and Friends rejoyce, *&c.* "And yet it followeth not from hence, that "holy men on earth, which rejoyce at the converſion of a ſinner, ſee the ſecrets of the "heart, 1 *Cor.*2.11. So likewiſe Angels, which "are miniſtring Spirits, *Hebr.* 1 14. may underſtand by the ſigns and fruits of true repentance, the converſion of divers ſinners, and "conſequently, they may rejoyce, without "intuitive knowledge of the heart.

Anſw. *White* againſt *Fiſher. p.* 315.

2. "Our Saviours words, *Luke* 15. 10. are "παραβολὴ, the concluſion of a parable, which "muſt not be ſtrained beyond the true ſcope. "But according to the expoſition of ſundry "† Fathers, and ſome learned || Papiſts: *The "hundred ſheep, v.* 4. repreſent the whole body "of the Elect, conſiſting of Men and Angels: "*the ninety and nine ſheep, not loſt*, were the Angels, perſiſting in their prime integrity: *The "ſtray ſheep*, all mankind ſinning in *Adam*. To "recover this loſt ſheep, the Son of God (that "good Shepheard, *Jo.* 10. 11.) was incarnate, "and by the gracious work of Redemption, he "laid the ſame on his ſhoulder. *Now there is "great joy in Heaven before the cœleſtial Angels, for "this recovery and ſalvation of mankind.* So that "no more can be inferred from this parable, "but that the Court of Heaven, and in the "ſame the holy Angels rejoyce, becauſe of "mans Redemption.

† *Ambroſ. l.*7. *in Luc. Hilar. in Matth.* 18 *Iſidor. lib. Alleg. Chryſol. Serm.*168. || *Cajet. & Titus Bo. in locum.*

3. When it is ſaid *that there is joy in Heaven*, we may expound it, as Dr. *Hammond* doth, not of the joy of Angels, but of God: and had we no reaſon to confirm this ſenſe, it is ſufficient

cient to destroy the force of what *T. G.* doth hence conclude from this citation, that it may fairly be expounded in that sense which rendereth it impertinent to his design: but since it is not said to be the joy of Angels, but that joy which is expressed ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων (*i. e.*) before the holy Angels; this doth sufficiently demonstrate that it is the joy of him, before whose face they stand continually. *Moreover*, it is confessedly God, who is compared to the Shepherd, and to the Woman seeking the lost Groat; And therefore the similitude requires that the joy conceived, when the lost Sheep and Groat is found, should be ascribed to him.

Object. *T.G. ib.* "*Whereas* our Saviour himself saith, That "*the just in the Resurrection shall be as the Angels in* "*Heaven, Matth.* 22. 30. (the equality as to "knowledge, not depending upon the body) "it follows by the *Analogy* of *Faith* that our "prayers and concerns are known also to the "*Saints*, now injoying the same blissful Vision "with the Angels.

Answ. Christ doth not only say, That the Spirits of just persons shall be like the Angels, but he expresseth wherein they shall be so, to wit, 1. In freedom from secular actions and passions. 2. In glorious Adoption, or real Possession of all the priviledges of the Sons of God. We cannot therefore hence infer a parity of qualities and operations betwixt the Angels and the Spirits of just men, but only a similitude of state and priviledges, as * Papists do themselves confess. 2. Christ doth not † say, The Spirits of just

* *Verum hæc authoritas (ut ingenuè fatear) solum æquat homines Angelis in hoc, quod nullum matrimonii usum habebunt, sicut nec Angeli; non tamen ibidem facit pares quantum ad facialem visionem Det.* Alph. de Castr. l. 3. c. Hær. v. Beat. v. Jansen. Harm. Evang. c. 117.

† *In illa requie positus, certè securus expectas judicii diem, quando recipias & corpus, quando immuteris ut angelo æquaris.* Aust. in Ps 36. f 61.

juſt men are as the Angels now, but that at the Reſurrection they ſhall be ſo. "Now I admire, what Papiſts can extort from hence "for invocation of Saints, for there is no "connexion between this Antecedent and Conſequent, to wit, *juſt men at the Reſurrection "ſhall live as Angels, remote from all the neceſſities "of a worldly life, and they ſhall be as the Angels "of God, free from material and corporeal paſſions, "and equal to the Angels in fruition of bleſſedneſs*: Ergo, *The knowledge of our prayers which we make in this life, is not to be denyed unto glorious Saints, the fellows of Angels.* White, p. 380.

The ſmoke of the Incenſes of the Prayers of the Saints aſcended from the hand of the Angel before God, Apoc 8 4. Ergo, *Our prayers and actions are not unknown to the Angels.* Object. ibid.

1. "This place of St. *John* proveth not, "either clearly or obſcurely, That holy Angels "hear the Prayers, or ſee the actions and affections of men. For the Angel mentioned, "is expounded by the antient Expoſitors, and "by the Romaniſts themſelves, not of an Angel by *Nature*, but of an Angel by *Office*; "and by ſome of them, of an Angel by *Type*. *Albertus* in his Commentary. St. *John*, ſaith, *Another Angel, that is Chriſt, who is the Angel of the Covenant*, Eſay 9. *Dionyſius Carthuſianus*, (a) *Catholick Doctors*, &c. *by this Angel underſtand Chriſt, who is the Angel of the great Counſel, and which by the myſtery of his incarnation, came into the world, and ſtood upon the Altar of the* Anſw. White, p. 314.

* *In locum.*

(a) *Doctores Catholici — per Angelum iſtum intelligunt myſterium Chriſtum, qui magni conſilii Angelus, & per incarnationis venit in mundum ſtetitque ante Altare, id eſt, in conſpectu Eccleſiæ.* Dionyſ. Carthuſ. in Apoc. 8.

Croſs.

Cross. Blasius (b) Viegas, a Jesuit, *We may easily perceive, that this Angel is Christ, because the thing here spoken of him, can agree to no other but Christ: for who but he, can with so great Majesty offer up to God the incense, that is, the Prayers of the Universal Church? who besides him, is able out of the perfuming pann, to send down into the Earth the fiery Coals of Divine Charity, and to inflame People with the burning Graces of the holy Spirit?* With these agree (c) *Ambrose*, (d) *Primasius*, (e) *Ansbertus*, (f) *Beda*, (g) *Haimo*, (h) *Hugo Cardinalis*, and the Glosses (i). But if it were granted, that this Angel were a created, or ministring Spirit, it cannot be proved that Angels understand the secret cogitations of mans heart any farther then the same are manifested by signs, neither is it consequent, that people ought to pray unto them, for Priests offer up the Prayers of the Church to God, and yet no man doth therefore invocate Priests.

(b) *Nec verò rectè, quidam è recentioribus argumentantur Angelum istum Christum esse non posse, quod Christus nunquam Angelus absolute dicitur: satis enim est ut ex consequentibus facile intelligi potest Christum esse, quæ nisi Christo alteri aptè accommodari non possunt, Cujus enim alterius est universæ Ecclesiæ incensa, hoc est orationes in Thuribulo aureo tanta Majestatis Specie patri offerre? Cujus præterquam Christi fuit de igne quo Thuribulum aureum erat impletum, partem in terras misisse, easque divini amoris igne inflammasse*, &c. *Apparet autem Christus sacerdotis personam gerens ut ejus pro nobis apud patrem intercessio atq; interpellatio monstretur.* Vieg. in Apoc. 8. Sec. 2. (c) Ambros. super Apoc. Vis. 3. cap. 8. (d) Primas. in Apoc. 8. Biblioth. Sanct. Colon. to. 9. p. 2. (e) Ansbert. in Apoc. 8. Bibl. Sanct. Col. to. 9. p. 393. (f) Bed. 5. super Apoc. lib. 2. (g) Haimo, in Apoc. 8. (h) Hugo Card. (i) Glossæ *totum legunt hoc de Christo.*

Object. *ibid.* *It is recorded of the Saints enjoying the same blissfull vision with the Angels, that they had golden Vials full of odours, which are the Prayers of Saints, that is, of the faithful upon earth.*

Answ. 1. The Reverend Dr. *Hammond*, and many other Expositors, Ancient and Modern, tell us that the four and twenty Elders are not the Mem-

Members of the Church triumphant, as *T. G.* without proof aſſerts; but the Biſhops and the Elders of the Church militant, whoſe office it is to preſent the Prayers and Praiſes of the Church to God. *Here it is more plainly declared,* ſaith Beda, *that the Beaſts and the Elders are the Church, redeemed by the blood of Chriſt, and gathered from the Nations; alſo he ſheweth in what Heaven they are, ſaying, they ſhall reign upon earth.* So *Ambroſe* on the *Apocalyps*, and *Haimo*.

2. *Voſſius* will tell you, That here is nothing intended, but Euchariſtal Prayers not Petitory; and that the four and twenty Elders only intimate, that the whole Family of Chriſtians in Earth and Heaven, did render continual Doxologies to God for the Redemption of the world by his Son.

The Pſalmiſt ſaith, *I will ſing unto thee in the ſight or preſence of the Angels*, Pſal. 137. 2. *The Angel of the Lord ſaid, O Lord of Hoſts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on* Jeruſalem, *and on the Cities of* Judah, *againſt which thou haſt had Indignation theſe threeſcore and ten years.* And *Michael* is a great Prince which ſtandeth for the Children of Gods people: *Ergo*, The Angels know the ſecrets of the heart, and are acquainted with the Prayers that men in any place put up unto them. Object. p. 418.

To theſe Objections I anſwer *Ha, Ha, He: Fieri ne poteſt ut homo qui ſic ratiocinatur homo ſit.* The *Pſalmiſt* alſo ſaith, *I will pay my vows in the preſence of thy people:* Ergo, All Gods people knew the ſecrets of the heart, &c. The Phanatick ſaith, *How long Lord wilt thou not remember, and have mercy upon the Godly Party, who have been under perſecution fourteen years:* Ergo, The Phanaticks know the ſecrets of the heart, &c. Anſw. *Valentia.*

&c. And blessed be God, King *Charles* the Second is a great Prince, who standeth for his People against the *Whore of Babylon*. He therefore knows the Prayers and necessities of all his People, he is acquainted with the secrets of the heart, and we may put up mental Prayers unto him. If *T. G.* have an estate worth begging, he may well fear that his performance here, and *p.* 222, 223. will rob him of it.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

The Contents.

The Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome, *touching the invocation of the Saints departed, delivered from their own Catechiſm and Liturgies, and the decree of the* Trent Councel. Sect. 1. *The Queſtion ſtated in ſeven Particulars.* Sect. 2. *The Idolatry of this practice proved;* 1. *Becauſe it doth aſcribe unto them the knowledge of the heart and of our confeſſions.* 2. *Becauſe Prayer to an abſent Being is the oblation of that Worſhip to it, which is proper to God. And ſo are Vows and Hymns.* Sect. 3. 3. *Becauſe the Apoſtles gave us no Precept or Example ſo to do.* Sect. 4. *The ſequel of this Argument is confirmed, and the Objections anſwered.* Sect. 5. *And the Argument from Miracles confuted.* Sect. 6.

HAving laid down theſe Propoſitions; let us now view the Doctrine and Practiſe of the *Church of Rome*, which the *Trent Councel* hath

hath delivered in these words: *viz.* * *That it is good and profitable, humbly to invoke the Saints, and fly unto their prayers and help; and that whosoever doth deny, that Saints, who do enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, ought to be invoked, or do assert that to intreat them to pray for any single person is Idolatry, or is repugnant to the word of God, or opposite to the honour of Jesus Christ our only Mediator; or that it is a foolish thing to pray unto them either with vocal, or with mental prayer, doth impiously think.* This they command, *all Pastors to teach to all their faithful people*; and they pronounce *Anathema* on any person that shall teach or think the contrary. The *Roman Catechism* informs us, That † *the Holy Church of God doth teach us piously and humbly to fly unto the Mother of God, and to entreat her by her intercession to reconcile God to us sinners, and to obtain those good things for us which are necessary both for this present life, and that which is eternal. Wherefore we exiled sons of* Eve, *who live in this vale of tears, continually ought to intreat this Mother of Mercy, and Advocate of faithful Peo-*

* *Mandat Sancta Synodus omnibus Episcopis & clericis docendi munus curámque sustinentibus, ut — fideles diligenter instruant docentes eos — Bonum atque utile esse suppliciter eos invocare, — ad eorum orationes opem auxiliúmq; confugere. Illos verò qui negant Sanctos, æterna felicitate in cœlo fruentes, invocandos esse; aut qui asserunt — eorum, ut pro nobis singulis orent, invocationem esse Idololatricam; vel pugnare cum verbo Dei, adversarique honori unius Mediatoris Dei & Hominis Jesu Christi, vel stultum esse in cœlo regnantibus voce vel mente supplicare, impiè sentire — Si quis autem his Decretis contraria docuerit aut senserit Anathema sit.* Sess. 25. c. 1.

† *Jure autem Sancta Dei Ecclesia huic Gratiarum actioni, preces etiam & implorationem Sanctissimæ Dei Matris adjunxit, quâ piè atque suppliciter, ad eam confugeremus, ut nobis peccatoribus, suâ Intermissione* conciliaret *Deum, bonaque tum ad hanc, tum ad æternam vitam necessaria impetraret. Ergo nos exules filii Evæ, qui hanc lachrymarum vallem incolimus; assiduè misericordiæ matrem, ac fidelis populi advocatam invocare debemus, ut oret pro nobis peccatoribus, ab eâque hac prece opem & auxilium implorare; cujus & præstantissima merita apud Deum esse, & summam voluntatem juvandi humanum Genus, nemo, nisi impiè & nefariè, dubitare potest.* Catech. Rom. Part. 4. c. 5. Sect. 8. p. 584.

ple,

ple, that she would pray for us sinners, and by this prayer to implore her help. Agreeable to this Doctrine are many Forms of Prayer recorded in the Antient *Missals* and *Breviaries* of the *Church of Rome*, and in those likewise which have been published, and corrected by the Decree and order of the Council held at *Trent*. For to St. *Peter* they pray thus:

Beate Pastor Petre, clemens accipe *Brev. Rom.*
Voces precantum, criminúmque vinculà
Verbo resolve, cui potestas tradita
Aperire terris Cœlum, apertum claudere.

Peter, blest Shepherd, graciously
Receive our Prayers, our bands of sin unty
By thy sole word, to whom the power is given
To open wide, and shut the Gate of Heaven.

To all the *Apostles* thus: *Commune Apost. p. 5.*

Vos sæcli justi judices
Et vera mundi lumina,
Votis precamur cordium
Audite preces supplicum.
Qui Cœlum VERBO claditis,
Seráque ejus Solvitis,
Nos à peccatis omnibus
Solvite JUSSU quæsumus.
Quorum præcepto *subditur*
Salus & languor omnium,
Sanate ægros moribus,
Nos reddentes Virtutibus.

You that are Judges of the world,
And its true lights that brightly shine,
With heartiest wishes we intreat
Our humble supplications hear,

Ye

Ye that do shut Heavens Temple Gates,
And by your word unlock the same,
Our guilty souls from punishment
Release, we pray, by your command.
For in an instant your commands
Sickness and health do both perceive.
Heal therefore our diseased minds;
And every Grace in us increase.

Miss. de Sancta Genouefa f. 12.

——Virgo dulcedine plena
In te sperantes audi, miserando precantes,
Dele Peccamen: Vexatis præbe juvamen:
Omnibus & mœstis solamen porrige semper.

To *Genouefa* thus:

Hear us that pray, blest *Genouefe*,
And pity those who hope in thee.
Blot out our sins, and send relief
And comfort in sad misery.

Miss. de Sancto Sebast. f. 13.

Cerne tuam familiam, quæ orat flexis genibus,
Serva à peste patriam istam, & à malis omnibus
Audi famulos rogantes, ô Martyr Sebastiane;
Serva corpus, sana mentes hujus plebis Christianæ:
Ne incurramus immane Barathrum confusionis,
Dona vespere & mane genitum compunctionis.

To Saint *Sebastian.*

Behold thy family which prayes with bended knee
Preserve this Country from the plague, let it no evil see.
Hear the desires of thy folk, Martyr *Sebastian*
Preserve the bodies, heal the minds of people Christian,
That we the horrid Gulph may fly of sad confusion,
At night and morning let us sigh with deep compunction.

Ista

Iſta per te gens ſit tuta — *Miſſ. Rom. Antiq.*
Et ne noceat acuta
Febris hac in patria ;
Ex quo noſtra ſpes eſt tota
In te Martyr, nunc remota
Sit peſtis mortifera.

May we from this ſharp fevers rage
Safe and unhurt hereafter be.
Its deadly influence aſſwage,
Since all our hopes are placed in thee.

Tu noſtrum columen, tu decus inclytum, — *Brev. Rom. Jani 30.*
Noſtrarum obſequium reſpice mentium ;
Romæ libens vota excipe, quæ pio
Te ritu canit & colit.

To St. *Martina.*

O thou our ſtay and chiefeſt ornament,
Regard the ready ſervice of our minds,
Rome's vows receive; which in devoteſt ſort
Doth praiſe and worſhip thee.

Promove noſtras Domino querelas
Caſtâque vota. — *Brev. Rom. Antiq. Mart. 20.*
Scis quot hic ſævis agitemur undis,
Triſte quos mundi mare defatigat,
Scis quot adnectat Satanas caroque
Prælia nobis.

To *Joachim.*

See our chaſte vows we make to God, be paid,
And all our Prayers promote, when we complain
Toſt in this Sea with many a cruel wave,
Thou know'ſt we weak and weather beaten are.
Thou know'ſt what combats we are like to have
Which fleſh and Satan, our ſworn foes, prepare.

Proprium Fest. Ordinis Minorum, f. 12.

Sis pro nobis advocata, causam nostræ
Paupertatis coram Deo sustine,
Et veniam de peccatis servis tuis obtine.

To the *Blessed Virgin.*

Be thou our Advocate with God, and plead
Our cause with him in thy poor peoples stead,
Obtain that pardon of our sins we need.

Brev. R.

Quicunque in alta syderum
Regnatis Aula Principes,
Favete votis supplicum
Qui dona Cœli flagitant.

To *all Saints.*

All ye that with the eternal King
As Princes reign above the Stars,
Favour the Prayers of Suppliants.

2. They do not only pray unto them, but they give *laud* and honor to them: And also do entreat them to *hear* and to *receive* their Praises.

Brev. R. in Festo S. Jacobi.

Jacobe *vindex Hostium*
Huc, Cœli ab altis sedibus,
Converte dexter lumina,
Audique late debitas
Grates tibi quas solvimus.

To St. *James* they speak thus:

The praises due that we do pay
To thee, hear joyfully this day.

Miss. Proprium Fest. f. 35. B. Ed. Antuep. 1577.

Ave salus hominum, Virgo decus virginum,
Te decet, post Dominum, laus & honor.

To the *blessed Virgin.*

Hail, oh thou happiness of Man
And Virgin, Flower of Virgin race.

All

All laud and honour be to God,
And to thee in the ſecond place.

But of this no man can be ignorant, there being nothing more common in their Books and mouths, than *Laus Deo & Beatæ Virgini.*

3. They alſo do confeſs their ſins unto them. In the Reformed *Roman Miſſal* we have theſe words:

† *I confeſs to God Almighty, and to the ever Bleſſed Virgin, to Bleſſed* Michael Archangel, *to Bleſſed* John Baptiſt, *to the Holy Apoſtles* Peter *and* Paul, *to all the Saints, and to you Brethren, that I have ſinned in thought, word and deed: And therefore I entreat the Bleſſed Virgin, the* Archangel Michael, *St.* John *the* Baptiſt, *St.* Peter *and St.* Paul, *and all the Saints, and you my Brethren, to pray for me to our Lord God.*

† *Confiteor Deo omnipotenti, Beatæ* Mariæ *ſemper Virgini, Beato* Michaeli Archangelo, *Beato* Joanni Baptiſtæ, *Sanctis Apoſtolis* Petro *&* Paulo, *omnibus Sanctis & vobis Fratres, quia peccavi nimis cogitatione verbo & opere.* — *Ideo precor Beatam* Mariam *ſemper Virginem, Beatum* Michaelem Archangelum, *Beatum* Joannem Baptiſtam, *Sanctos Apoſtolos* Petrum *&* Paulum, *omnes Sanctos & vos Fratres orare pro me ad Dominum Deum noſtrum. Ordinarium Miſſæ. p.*217. Ed. Antuerp. F. 1605.

This is the doctrine and practice of the Church of *Rome*, and it contains theſe ſeven particulars.

1. That it is good and profitable for every faithful man, and exiled Son of *Eve*, to pray unto the Bleſſed Virgin, and the Saints departed.

2. That it is good and profitable thus to intercede not only for the good and welfare of the Church in general, but for every ſingle perſon.

Aguſt. Ser. 37. de Sanctis. Ser. 3. de pluribus Mart. In Com. plurium Mart. extra tempus Paſch. Lect. 4.

3. Whereas the ancient Church ſpake thus, *As often as we celebrate the ſolemnities of holy Martyrs, let us ſo expect by their interceſſion to obtain from the Lord temporal benefits, that by imitating the Martyrs themſelves, we may deſerve to receive eternal,* (which words are ſtill retained in the *Roman* Breviary) we are now taught to pray unto them, for all the bleſſings neceſſary to *eternal life*; nay we are told that * *God will give eternal life to thoſe that do adore the Bleſſed Virgin.*

* *Gaude mater miſerorum quia pater ſæculorum dabit te colentibus Congruentem hic mercedem, & ſælicem poli ſedem, Regnis in cæleſtibus.*

4. It is the Doctrine of the *Church* of *Rome*, that Saints departed may, and ſhould be invocated, as well by *mental*, as by *vocal* Prayer. This was decreed at *Trent*; this *Paſtors* are enjoyned to teach their People; and laſtly, this we have confirmed by their practice in theſe words, *With the deſires of our hearts we pray unto you, regard the ready ſervice of our minds.*

Proſa de Beata Maria f. 30. apud Miſſale Rom. Ed. Antuerp. 1577.

5. Theſe Practices and theſe Petitions are many of them built upon this ſuppoſition, that the Bleſſed Saints do hear our prayers, and are acquainted with our hopes, and with the praiſes which we offer to them; and conſequently the *Church* of *Rome*, in whoſe ſolemnities theſe prayers are uſed, muſt be deemed to aſcribe this knowledge to them. For what more fooliſh and abſurd than conſtantly to call upon them to *hear*, *behold*, and to *receive*, to *regard*, *favour*, and *promote* our prayers; when we complain, to *pity*, and conſider them that pray, to be their Advocates, and plead their cauſes, if theſe addreſſes be not underſtood by thoſe *Bleſſed Spirits* to whom they are particularly directed? Who knows not that to be our Advocate, is to commend our cauſe to God, and to entreat that our deſires may be granted? And who

who knows not that our cauſe cannot be thus commended, or our deſires repreſented, till they firſt be underſtood? Moreover, ſeeing they do requeſt theſe *Bleſſed Spirits* to receive their vows, and to take care that they be paid to God, to hear and to receive their praiſes; ſeeing they do confeſs their ſins unto them, and therefore do entreat them to intercede with God in their behalf; ſeeing they do endeavour to move them to commiſerate their ſtate, by ſaying, that they place their *hopes* and *only confidence* upon their interceſſion, they muſt acknowledge that theſe *Bleſſed Spirits* are acquainted with their confeſſions and their vows, their hopes and praiſes: and therefore albeit this conſequence ſhould be denied, *We pray unto the Saints departed, therefore they do hear us*, yet this can never be denied, *We pray unto them to hear, and to receive our prayers and praiſes, vows and confeſſions*, and therefore we believe they do. T. C. p.

6. Hence it is manifeſt, that Papiſts do not only pray unto them, to intercede with God for bleſſings, but do deſire that the Bleſſed Spirits would themſelves confer them. Thus they entreat St. *Peter by the power given to him, to unty the bonds of their iniquity*; and the Apoſtles to abſolve them from their ſins *by their command*; and to their *Guardian Angel* they ſpeak thus, *Take hold of ſword and buckler, and riſe up to help me, ſay unto my ſoul, I am thy ſalvation.* And therefore that they only do entreat them to pray for and with us, is a great untruth.

7. Seeing the Church of *Rome* allows of *mental Prayers* addreſſed to the Saints; ſeeing their Lyturgy ſpeak thus, *With the deſires of our hearts we pray unto you, receive the ready ſervice of*

our minds; seeing they do instruct us in all places, and upon all occasions, to fly unto their help and succour; seeing they do ascribe unto them the knowledge not only of their vows and praises, but of their inward hopes, they consequently do ascribe unto them the knowledge of the heart, and the internal motions of every supplicant, as far as these petitions and other actions do require it. This is that Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, which we think justly charged with Idolatry.

For 1. To ascribe unto the Saints departed by way of worship, that excellency which is proper to God, is Idolatry; but to ascribe unto them by an act of worship, the knowledge of the hearts of them that pray unto them, is to ascribe unto them that excellency which is proper to God, by *Propos.*2. *Ergo.*

2. Prayer offered and put up in any time, or place, to an invisible and incorporeal Being, is the oblation of that worship to it which is due to God, by *Prop.*4. *Corol.*3. but this devotion of the *Roman* Church, is prayer offered up in any time, or place, to an invisible and incorporeal Being, and therefore must be the oblation of that worship which is due to God; and being offered to those *Blessed Spirits* which are confessedly Creatures, it must be the oblation of that worship which is due to God unto the Creature, which we have proved to be Idolatry.

3. To vow to Saints departed, is to ascribe unto them the honour due to the Creator, by *Prop* 4. *Corol.*2. but Papists vow unto the Saints departed, therefore they do ascribe unto them the honour due to the Creator. The Answer *Bellarmine* returns unto the Major of this Argument,

ment, is this, That *to vow, in ſign of gratitude to the firſt and chiefeſt Good, and in recognition of a benefit received from him as the firſt Author of it, is the worſhip due to God*; *but we may vow to Saints, in ſign of gratitude to them, conſidered as Mediators and Interceſſors, by whom we do receive Gods bleſſings.* But this diſtinction hath no foundation to depend upon; and with like reaſon we may diſtinguiſh thus of Sacrifice, (and of whatever elſe is proper to God) and ſay, That *to offer Sacrifice to any thing, under the notion of the firſt and chiefeſt Good, is to aſcribe unto it the worſhip due to God alone*; *but notwithſtanding we may offer Sacrifice to Saints, in ſign of gratitude to them, conſidered as Mediators and Interceſſors, by whom we do obtain Gods bleſſings.* * *Aquinas* doth diſtinguiſh thus, That in a vow we have two things, 1. The matter of it, and that is the promiſe. 2. The form or eſſence, *viz.* the direction of that promiſe to God: *the matter of the vow*, ſaith he, *i. e. the promiſe we indeed make to Saints, and only vow to God, we will be faithful to this promiſe which we make to them.* This Anſwer *Bellarmine* rejects as being falſe, and contradictory to what they practiſe: *For*, ſaith he, || *The Vows we make to Saints, are terminated on the Saints, ſo that we really do vow unto them.* And again, † *The name of Vow is general, and agrees both to God and Saints, for otherwiſe men would not dare to*

* *Dicendum quod votum ſoli Deo fit, ſed promiſſio poteſt etiam fieri homini—& per hunc modum intelligendum eſt votum, quo quis vovet aliquid Sanctis vel Prælatis, ut ipſis promiſſio facta Sanctis vel Prælatis cadat ſub voto materialiter, in quantum ſcilicet homo vovet Deo ſe impleturum quod Sanctis vel Prælatis promittit.* Aquin. 2a 2æ. qu. 88. Art. 5.

|| *Vota quæ fiunt Sanctis, terminantur etiam ad ipſos Sanctos, ita ut revera ipſis vota fiant.* L. 3. de cultu Sanctorum, c. 9.

† *Voti nomen eſt generale, quod convenit Deo & Sanctis, alius nemo dicere auderet, voveo Deo & Beatæ* Mariæ, *& etiam ſimpliciter vove Beatæ* Mariæ. Ibid.

ſay, I vow to God and to the Bleſſed Virgin, and ſimply I vow unto the Bleſſed Virgin. And certainly no reaſon can be given, why *I vow to God* ſhould be a formal Vow, and *I Vow unto the Bleſſed Virgin* ſhould not be ſo. 3. They by this promiſe do aſcribe unto the Saints the knowledge of our hearts, and of our promiſes, whence they deſire them to *hear*, and to *receive their vows*, and ſo they do aſcribe unto them Gods uncommunicated excellency.

4. To put up Hymns unto the *bleſſed Angels*, and the *Saints deceaſed*, is to be guilty of *Idolatry*.. But Papiſts put up Hymns unto the *Bleſſed Angels* and the *Saints departed*, Ergo, The *minor* is apparent both from the *Roman Miſſal* and the *Breviary*, where we find many *Hymns* directed to thoſe *Bleſſed Spirits*; the *major* may be thus confirmed. To pay that honor to theſe *Bleſſed Spirits*, which is due to God alone, is to be guilty of Idolatry. To offer *Hymns* unto them, is to pay that honor to theſe *Bleſſed Spirits*, which is due to God alone: Ergo. The *major* is apparent from *Chap.* 6. *Prop.* 1. The *minor* I prove thus: To pay that honor to theſe *Bleſſed Spirits*, which *Chriſtians* paid to God alone, is to pay that honor to them, which alone is due to God (for why ſhould the whole *Church of Chriſt*, which, if we may believe the *Romaniſt*, received ſo great advantage by their addreſſes to theſe *Bleſſed Spirits*, refuſe to pay unto them thoſe *Hymns* and Praiſes which were due unto them, and which on this account are offered to them by the *Church of Rome?*) but to offer *Hymns* unto them, is to give that honor to them which Chriſtians paid to God *alone*. For *Origen* doth in the name of all his fellow Chriſtians ſay, * *We offer up our Hymns only to God and his Son Jeſus Chriſt.*

* Ὕμνους δὲ εἰς μόνον τὸν ὑπὲρ πάσας λόγῳ θεὸν, καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ θεὸν λόγον. Ita Orig. contr. Celſ. l. 8. p. 422.

5 To

5. To aſcribe to all the *Saints departed*, and the *holy Angels*, the knowledge of the confeſſion of our ſins, and upon that account to beg that they would intercede for pardon of them, is to be guilty of Idolatry. But the *Romaniſt* doth in the Service of the *Miſſal*, aſcribe to all the *Bleſſed Spirits* the knowledge of the ſins they do confeſs, and upon that account do beg that they would intercede for pardon of them: *Ergo*. The *major* may be thus confirmed; To aſcribe to all theſe *Bleſſed Spirits*, now in Heaven, the knowledge of thoſe confeſſions which we make on Earth, and thoſe petitions we put up unto them, is to be guilty of Idolatry by *Prop.* 2. *Chap.* 6. and *Prop.* 4. *Corol.* 3. of the ſame *Chapter*: But to aſcribe unto them the knowledge of the confeſſion of our ſins, and upon that account to beg that they would intercede for pardon of them, is to aſcribe unto them the knowledge of thoſe petitions and confeſſions which we make on Earth: For this is to ſuppoſe, that albeit theſe *Bleſſed Spirits* are as diſtant from us, as is Earth from Heaven, yet are they as aſſuredly acquainted with our confeſſions and petitions, as if they had been preſent with us, for who would move another to intercede in his behalf, by reaſon of that confeſſion he hath made unto him, who did not think he knew both his confeſſions and petitions? *Ord. Miſſæ p.* 217.

6 This may be ſtrongly argued from two conſiderations: (1.) *That the Apoſtles did not invoke the Saints departed, or give us any Precept or Example ſo to do.* (2.) *That they abſtained from this practiſe, becauſe they did not think this honor to be due to Saints departed, but to God alone.* And firſt, That the Apoſtles did not invoke the Saints departed, that they did put up no petitions to the

the *Patriarchs* and *Prophets*, or to the *B. Virgin*, or to the *Proto-Martyr Stephen*, or to *James*, *the brother of our Lord*, is evident from an impartial view of all their Writings and Epiſtles; for thoſe Epiſtles, Acts, and Goſpels, were written to promote the cauſe of Piety, and to inſtruct us in the means and helps which they conceived moſt proper to preſerve us from the aſſaults and temptations of Sin, Satan, and the
Joh. 20, 31. World, they do aſſure us, That *theſe things were written that we might believe, and believing might have life eternal*: and ſo to give us thoſe directions which were chiefly inſtrumental to obtain that end; whence it doth follow, that if they had conceived this practiſe to be ſo highly inſtrumental to the promotion of our eternal happineſs, as doth the *Church of Rome*, and the enjoyment of all thoſe ſpiritual favours which they expect and beg from thoſe bleſſed Spirits, they would not wholly have omitted what ſo highly did conduce to the obtaining of thoſe bleſſings. The *Church of Rome* commands her
Syn. Trid. Seſſ. 25. *Biſhops*, *Prieſts*, and *Curates*, *diligently to inſtruct the Flock committed to their charge* in this important duty; and to inform them, that it is very *good and profitable to fly unto their prayers for help and refuge*; that we muſt *daily invocate the Bleſſed Virgin*, and that it is *a wicked and moſt hainous*
Catech. Rom. p. 584. *crime to doubt either her readineſs to help, or that her merits are moſt prevailing for this end.* Their practiſe doth inform us that there is not any bleſſing which our Souls can wiſh for, but Chriſtians ſhould implore it from them: And if their Doctrine were according unto Piety their practiſe muſt aſſuredly be ſo. For what more proper then to implore their aid, who are ſo highly inſtrumental to preſerve us from our moſt fatal

tal Enemies, and to procure all thoſe bleſſings, which are needful both to the Piety of this preſent life, and to the felicity of that which is to come. St. *Paul* is in like manner large and copious in theſe inſtructions which he gives unto the *Paſtors* of the *Church*, and to the people committed to their charge: He informs us that we muſt all pray, and *for all men*; that we muſt pray with *pure hands*, and with hearts free from *wrath and doubting*: He tells us in what language we ſhould frame our prayers, *viz.* in ſuch a language *that all that hear may underſtand*, and ſay *Amen* to our Petitions: in what poſture both men and women ought to pray: and that this duty ought to be performed *in all places*. And yet this perſon who deſcends to theſe minute particulars, ſpeaks not one word of this important duty, ſo pious and profitable in it ſelf, ſo neceſſary to preſerve us from the worſt of Enemies, and to procure the greateſt bleſſings: Nay, in all the Scripture which was written *to make us wiſe*, and *thorowly inſtructed unto all good works*, we have not the leaſt mention of it: In thoſe Epiſtles they frequently enjoyn us *to be inſtant in prayer, to pray alwayes, with all prayer and ſupplication in the ſpirit, and to watch thereunto with all perſeverance and ſupplication for all Saints: To continue in prayer, and watch in the ſame with thanksgiving: To pray without ceaſing: To put up ſupplications, prayers, interceſſions, and giving of thanks for all men. To be careful for nothing, but in every thing with prayer and thanksgiving to let our requeſts be made known unto God.* And to go unto *that God for wiſdom, who giveth unto all men liberally, and upbraideth not.* They alſo do exhort us to *pray for others that they may be ſaved, particularly, for every brother, that hath not ſinned unto death.*

1 Cor. 14.
2 Tim. 3. 15, 16, 17.
Eph. 6. 18.
Col. 4. 2.
1 Theſſ. 5. 17.
1 Tim. 2. 1.
Phil. 4 6.
James 1. 5.
5. 16.
1 Joh. 5. 16.

death. Now ſurely they, who do ſo frequently diſcourſe upon this ſubject, and upon the leſſer circumſtances of this duty, would not have omitted to mention ſomething of this ſo profitable practiſe, if they had really believed it ſo to be. For wherefore do they give us theſe directions, but to preſerve us againſt the power of temptation, and the aſſaults of Sin and Satan? Why do they frequently enjoyn us to be inſtant in the performance of this duty, but that we may obtain thoſe ſpiritual bleſſings which without great danger to our ſouls we cannot want? If then the Invocation of the Saints departed, and eſpecially of the *Virgin Mary*, be ſo highly profitable to theſe ends, why ſhould theſe men, I ſay, be ſilent in this matter, who being guided by the *Holy Spirit*, could not forget to do it, and being as concerned for the *Churches* welfare, as the *Trent Fathers*, could not for want of zeal unto Gods glory, or the good of Souls, neglect to charge *all Paſtors diligently to inſtruct the people* in this moſt profitable and pious practiſe? Why ſhould theſe men, who both by precept and example do inſtruct us to requeſt the prayers of living friends, be wanting both in precept and example to move us to requeſt the more prevailing prayers of Bleſſed Spirits? they who command us when we are infirm to have recourſe unto the prayers of ſurviving *Paſtors*, and *to pray for one another*, becauſe the *fervent ſupplication of a righteous man availeth much*, why ſhould they never ſend us to the *B. Virgin*, to the *Patriarchs* and *Prophets*, to St. *Stephen* and St. *James*, and other early *Martyrs* of the *Church*, whoſe Prayers, if we believe the *Roman Church*, are highly meritorious, and far more prevailing. Nay, they had the greater

reaſon

reason to inculcate this, because it was a novel practise, and never used by the *Jewish Church*; and therefore they had need of an Express to move and to encourage them to such devotions: Whereas it was the daily custom of all *Jews* to put up their petitions to the God of Heaven. Since therefore neither *Paul*, or *Peter*, or *James*, or *John*, *Apostles*, or *Evangelists*, have left us any precept or example for this practice, we may be certain they did not approve it.

Moreover, to move us more effectually to the performance of this duty, they tell us, That *the eyes of God are still intent upon the just, and his ear open to their prayer*; that he is well acquainted with those inward *groans* and wishes, which we do, or cannot utter; and is also able to perform *exceedingly above what we can ask or think*; that he is good and gracious to *all that call upon him faithfully*, that *he will fulfill the desires of them that fear him*: Thus also do the *Latines* teach concerning the *Saints departed*; they tell us in the words of *Basil*, οὐδεὶς τούτων ἐστὶν ὃς οὐχὶ παντακοῦ καθορᾷ, they confidently ascribe unto them *Summam juvandi voluntatem, the greatest readiness to help, and the most prevailing merits*: and this they do most sutably to that presumption they have taken up; for all these things are the more needful to be taught, because both Scripture seems to say the contrary, affirming that Saints departed are *ignorant of us*, and our concernments here on Earth: and denying that any besides God can know the secrets of the heart. And secondly, the things themselves seem difficult to be believed; *viz. That Creatures at so infinite a distance can be acquainted with what is done on earth*; much more that they should at such a distance understand the secret motions of the heart,

1 Pet. 3. 12.
Rom. 8. 26
Eph. 3. 20.
Matth. 7. 7. 11.
James 1. 5.
Catech. Rom. p. 585.

heart. Why is it then that the Apoſtles, who do ſo often mind us of what we have leſs reaſon to ſuſpect, *viz.* That God is able, and very ready to perform what we deſire, and that he hears the ſecret groanings of our heart, ſhould not inform us of what is ſo exceeding hard, and yet ſo neceſſary to be believed of theſe *Bleſſed Spirits?* Whoſoever diligently reads their Writings, will find them praying earneſtly to God for all thoſe bleſſings to be conferred upon the Chriſtians, which *Papiſts* do requeſt from Saints and *Angels*, That *the God of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt would give to the* Epheſians *the ſpirit of Wiſdome and*
Eph. 1. *Revelation in the knowledge of him, the eyes of their*
17, 18. *Underſtanding being enlightned*: That he would
—3.17. grant *that Chriſt might dwell in their hearts by faith,*
18.19. *that they might be ſtrengthned by his Spirit in the inner man, that they being rooted and grounded in love, might be able to comprehend with all Saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; And to know the love of God which paſſeth knowledge, and be filled with all fulneſs of God.* That the Phi-
Phil. 1. 9, lippians *love might abound more in knowledge, and*
10, 11. *in all judgment, that they might approve things that are excellent, and be ſincere, and without offence till the day of Chriſt; Being filled with the fruits of righteouſneſs, to the praiſe and glory of God.* That the
Col. 1. 9, Coloſſians *might be filled with the knowledge of the*
10, 11. *will of God in all wiſdom, and ſpiritual underſtanding, that they might walk worthy of the Lord unto all well pleaſing, being fruitful in every good work, and increaſing in the knowledg of God: Strengthened with all might, according to his glorious power unto all patience*
1 Theſſ. 3. *and long-ſuffering with joyfulneſs:* That the *Theſſa-*
12, 13. *lonians* might encreaſe in love, and have their
—2. 1. hearts eſtabliſhed unblamable in holineſs before
11, 12. God. *That God would count them worthy of his calling,*

calling, and fulfil all the good pleaſure of his goodneſs, and the work of faith with power: That the God of Peace would make the Hebrews *perfect in every good work, to do his will, working in them that which is well pleaſing in his ſight: That the God of Grace would make them perfect, ſtabliſh, ſtrengthen, ſettle them.* Heb. 13. 20,21. 1 Pet. 5. 10.

Theſe Supplications were their daily exerciſe, and had they thought the Invocation of the *bleſſed Virgin*, the *Patriarchs* and *Prophets*, the *Proto-Martyr*, and *the brother of our Lord*, would have been needful and effectual to the attainment of theſe things, for which they prayed ſo earneſtly, why do they never once addreſs themſelves unto them; why do they never pray as doth the *Church* of *Rome*, that through the *deprecation, intervention, patrocination*, and *interceſſion* of theſe perſons, they may be worthy to obtain theſe bleſſings, why do they never pray by the *merits* of theſe perſons to be delivered from * Hell, and made partakers of the joys of Heaven, as doth the *Roman Blaſphemy*? Why do they not declare with them, that they do † *place their confidence* in the petitions of theſe prevailing *Saints* and *bleſſed Spirits*? Why do they not aſcribe their mercys and deliverances to *the* || *merits of theſe Saints*, as they moſt inſolently do? Aſſuredly on this account, becauſe they did not in their hearts approve the practiſe. Were *bleſſed Paul* alive to ſee his Propheſy ſo punctually fulfilled: *That in theſe later times men ſhould depart from the Faith, attending to erroneous Spirits,* καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων, *and to the Do-*

Brevarium & Miſſal.

* *Deus qui beatum* Nicolaum P. ---*tribue quæſumus ut ejus meritis & precibus à Gehennæ incendiis liberemur.* Miſſ. in feſt. ſanct. Nich. Dec. xi.

Deus qui beatum Ludovicum——*jus quæſumus meritis & interceſſione Regis Regum Jeſu Chriſti filii tui facias nos eſſe conſortes.* in Feſt. beat. Lud. Aug. 25.

† In Feſt. ſanct. Agapiti Aug. 28.

|| *Accepta tibi ſit, Domine, ſacratæ plebis oblatio pro tuorum Honore Sanctorum quorum ſe meritis percepiſſe de tribulatione cognoſcit auxilium.* Miſſ. Dec. xi. p. 357. Ed. Antwerp. 1605.

Etiam

ctrine of worshipping departed Souls, how would he passionately cry out *O foolish Romanists who hath bewitched you*, &c. Lastly, St. *Paul* had such an ardent zeal to the promotion of the *Gospel*, that he omits no help which he conceives might give a blessing to his labours: He therefore passionately intreats the Christians to whom his writings are directed, *That they would strive together with him in their prayers to God, that he might be delivered from them, who did not believe in Judea, and that his Service which he had for Jerusalem might be accepted of the Saints: and that he might come unto them with joy —— and with them be refreshed*: *That they would alwaies, and with all perseverance pray for him, that utterance might be given unto him that he might open his mouth boldly to make known the Mystery of the Gospel*: That they would *continue in prayer, that God would open unto him a door of utterance to speak the mystery of Christ: for which he was in bands that he might make it manifest, as he ought to speak. Finally Brethren*, saith he, *pray for us that the word of the Lord may have free course, and be glorified even as it is with you: And that we may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men: for all men have not Faith.* So *blessed Paul*; and had he thought that his addresses to the *Patriarchs*, and *Prophets*, the *blessed Virgin*, the *Quire of Angels*, or the *Saints made perfect*, would have been more effectual to this end, would not his zeal have prompted him to have put up one request unto them? or one Petition to his *Guardian-Angel* to be defended from these unreasonable men? If all these circumstances be considered it will amount to an invincible conviction of the falshood of that determination of the *Church* of *Rome*, * that this is the practise which was *derived from the Apostles*, and hath been *still continued in the Church of Christ*.

Rom. 15. 30, 31.

Eph. 6. 18, 19.

Col. 4. 1, 2, 3.

1 Thes. 5. 25. 2—3. 1. 2.

* *Juxta Catholicæ & Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ usum à primævis Christianæ Religionis temporibus receptum.* Concil. Trid. Sess. 25.

2. No

2. No other reaſon can be given why they did not practiſe, or commend the Invocation of the *bleſſed Spirits* beſides this, that they conceived this worſhip to be that honour God had reſerved for himſelf, and that they looked upon it as a vain and fruitleſs practice, The knowledg of the heart, and of the Prayers that are put up by All men, at all times, and in all places of the Earth, being the knowledg proper to the God of Heaven, and not communicated to the Saints deceaſed. This will appear more evident if we conſider and refute thoſe ſhifts whereby they do endeavour to evade the force of this triumphant Evidence. And

"1. They tell us that * had the Bleſſed Apo-"ſtles taught this doctrine it might have been "objected to them, that they ſought their own "advancement, and honour by the propaga-"tion of their Goſpel, and proudly did en-"deavour to be worſhipped by their Chriſtian "followers.

* *Si Apoſtoli & Evangeliſtæ docuiſſent ſanctos venerandos, arrogantiæ iis datum fuiſſet, ac ſi poſt mortem gloriam illam quæſiviſſent; voluit ergo Spiritus Sanctus expreſſis Scipturis docere invocationem Sanctorum.* Eckius in Enchirid. loc. Com. ex edit. Alex. Weiſſenhorn. Alanus Copus Dial. 3. fol. 239.

Repl. 1. This anſwer gives us ſome ſhew of reaſon why this Invocation was not enjoyned in Scripture; but it affords not the leaſt ſhadow of a reaſon why it was not practiſed.

2. Either this Invocation was practiſed by the *Church* in the *Apoſtles* time or not; if not, then the *Trent Council*, and the *Roman Catechiſm*, falſly do aſſert, that *this was the perpetual and Apoſtolick practice of the Church of Chriſt*; if it was practiſed, then that practice muſt give riſe unto the ſame Objection, *viz.* that the Diſciples of

Quem ſemper Eccleſia Catholica adhibuit. Cat. Rom. p. 3 c. 2. Sect. 8.

Christ had brought into the world this custom on purpose to advance their honour, and to procure worship to themselves.

3. This doctrine had it been consistent with the Christian Faith ought more especially to have been often preached to the Jews to reconcile them to that Faith, by giving them assurance, that they might have recourse unto the prayers of Father *Abraham*, and their beloved *Moses*, and that *Noah*, *Job* and *Daniel*, *Elijah*, *Samuel* and all the blessed *Patriarchs* and *Prophets*, who were so powerful with God on Earth, would upon their request be ready to procure for them the greatest *Temporal* and *Spiritual* blessings, since therefore we have no such Revelation in any of these Writings or Epistles, which are especially directed to them, and were designed for their conversion and satisfaction; it may be well concluded this was no doctrine of the Christian faith.

2. Some others do assert, That the Apostles did abstain from giving any precept, or example of this Invocation, lest "Heathens should "conceive, that for the multitude of Heathen "* Deities they worshipped, the Christians "only introduced a multitude of Christian "Gods. *Repl.*

* *Nondum erat tempus in ipsius fidei exordiis eam mundo doctrinam divulgandi ne Gentiles arbitrarentur plures nos Deos colere.* Alanus Copus Dial. 3. f. 239. & Eckius ubi supra.

1. This evasion is a meer conjecture, of which we have not the least hint in any of the *Ancient Fathers*, or the *Church Historians*, which is sufficient to crack the credit of it; for that such a change should happen in the worship of the whole Church of Christ, without the notice or observation of any single person, is incredible. Besides, this figment thwarts that declaration of St. *Paul*, that he *was not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ*; and that profession, that he

with-

with-held not from them any uſeful *Doctrine*: it thwarts that Doctrine, and Aſſertion of the *Church* of *Rome*, that this hath been *the conſtant cuſtom of the Church of God, including the Apoſtles time*. Beſides, the reaſons of abſtaining from this practice, muſt continue as long as there were *Heathens* to be converted to the Chriſtian Faith, and ſo beyond the time of *Conſtantine*. Now albeit it be a certain truth, that *Chriſtians till after the days of* Conſtantine *abſtained from this practice*, yet cannot that Aſſertion conſiſt with the pretences of the Church of *Rome* for *Apoſtolical Tradition*, and derivation of theſe Doctrines, which they obtrude upon us from the *Apoſtles* of our Lord. 4. Either theſe Primitive Profeſſors were not well adviſed, to let this fear of *Scandal* deter them from the publication of a truth, ſo pious and profitable to the Church of Chriſt, or elſe the *Roman Doctors* are not ſo cautious in their attempts to propagate the Goſpel as they ought to be, as not concealing from the † *Pagans*, whom they endeavour to convert, this ſo ſuſpicious practice of their Church. In a word, if the Apoſtles and the Church of Chriſt which was converted by, and flouriſhed under them, had no ſuch practice, certain it is we have no reaſon now to do what they did never practiſe or command, for all inſtructions we embrace as from them, muſt be what they did teach or practiſe; but if they did admit this practice, then could not *Jews* and *Heathens* want the knowledge of it, ſeeing the number of *Apoſtates* and *hypocritical Profeſſors* was ſo great, and there were many who took upon them the profeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith, only to ſpy out what they practiſed.

Act. 20. 20

† 8. *Dall. de cultu Latino To. 1. l. 3. cap. 25. p. 493.*

Gal 2. 4. Phil. 1. 16

3. If it be ſaid, they might abſtain by reaſon of ſome precept, which forbad this Invocation. I reply, that which Gods wiſdom doth forbid us to give unto the nobleſt of his Creatures, he by ſo doing doth declare that he reſerves unto himſelf, and when we act againſt his precept, we may be certain that he will not reveal or manifeſt that ſupplication which he hath forbidden; and therefore they that tender to theſe Bleſſed Spirits this forbidden worſhip, muſt aſcribe unto them that knowledge which agrees to God alone, and that honour which he will not give unto another, and ſo be guilty of Idolatry. To conclude, If this Invocation were ſo beneficial to mankind, and was not derogatory to Gods honour, it might be well preſumed, that Chriſt and his Apoſtles would have been careful to inſtruct us in it, for they neither wanted knowledge to perceive the benefit, or love ſufficient to engage them to acquaint us with it.

P. 420. Laſtly, Whereas *T. G.* objects, That "*it* "*is certain by many and great Miracles wrought by* "*God, upon addreſſes made to the Saints, that thoſe* "*who call upon them are heard, and obtain what they* "*deſire; and that therefore it cannot be unlawful or* "*Idololatrical to deſire their interceſſion. Anſw.* This is an Argument in which the *Romaniſts* much triumph; but it is only what their Brother *Donatiſts* had urged long before, and what St. *Auſtin* hath admirably anſwered. And firſt, I ſay, It is but a Tranſlation of that Argument, which formerly was uſed by the *Donatiſts*, in confirmation of their Schiſm; for thus St. *Auſtin* propoundeth their Objection: * *Let him not ſay that therefore they are in the right, becauſe that* Pontius, *or* Donatus, *or any other, did*

L. de unitate Ecc. contra Petiliani Donatiſtæ *Epiſtolam.*

* *Non dicat verum eſſe quia hoc ego*

did such and such Miracles, or because men pray at the memorials of our Martyrs, (i. e. the Martyrs of the *Donatists) and they are heard; and because such and such things do happen there; or because such a Brother or a Sister watching there saw such a sight, or dreamed such a dream.* This is the Argument of *T. G.* and his Brother *Donatists*, and we *Protestants* crave only leave to answer what St. *Austin* doth, *viz.* (1.) *That either the things are not true which are spoken, or if some Miracles be wrought by Hereticks, we ought to be more careful; because our Lord Christ having said, that there should come Deceivers, who should work such Miracles,* * *as to deceive, if it were possible, the very Elect; He adds, by way of vehement commendation, this, Behold I have foretold you; whence the Apostle admonishing us, saith,* † *Now the Spirit manifestly teacheth, that in the latter times some shall depart from the Faith, giving heed to seducing Spirits, and* Doctrinis Dæmoniorum, *i. e.* the Doctrine of worshipping the Spirits of dead men. Which Answer doth contain three things, (1.) *That the truth of these relations may be well suspected*; and so also may the truth of what *T. G.* delivers, as from St. *Basil*, *Austin*, and *Theodoret*: for, as I shall shew hereafter, we have just reason to suspect

dico, aut quia hoc dixit ille Collega meus aut illi Collegæ mei, aut illi Episcopi vel Clerici vel Laici nostri, aut ideo verum est quia illa & illa Mirabilia fecit Donatus, *vel* Pontius, *vel quilibet alius, aut quia homines ad memorias mortuorum nostrorum orant & exaudiuntur, aut quia illa & illa ibi contingunt, aut quia ille Frater noster, aut illa Soror nostra tale visum vigilans vidit vel tale visum dormiens somniavit; removeantur ista vel figmenta mendacium hominum vel portenta fallacium Spirituum; aut enim non sunt vera quæ dicuntur, aut si Hæreticorum aliqua mira sunt facta, magis cavere debemus quod cum dixisset Dominus quosdam futuros esse fallaces qui nonnulla signa faciendo etiam Electos si fieri posset fallerent, adjecit vehementer commendans & ait, ecce prædixi vobis, unde & Apostolus admonens Spiritus autem manifeste dicit quia in novissimis temporibus recedent quidam à fide intendentes Spiritibus seductoribus & Doctrinis Dæmoniorum.* Ibid. c. 16. p. 116. I. K.

* Mat. 24. † 1 Tim. 4.

the falshood and depravation of these passages which he hath cited from *Austin* and *Theodoret*, and that St. *Basil* doth not say that any man was cured by the Invocation of those XL. *Martyrs*, but only by praying with them, or by the intercession which they make of their own accord, for those who frequent their shrines. (2.) St. *Austin* hath but two instances of any benefit received by Prayers put up unto the Martyr, and before he mentions them, he doth ingenuously confess, * That *they are not backed with so good Authority, as that we should believe them without doubt or difficulty.* (3.) We have just reason to suspect the truth of these relations, if we consider (1.) That St. † *Chrysostome* declares that Miracles were ceased in his time, and hath a set discourse on purpose to inform us, διὰ τὶ σημεῖα νῦν οὐ γίνεται, i.e. *why Miracles then ceased:* which had they been so common in the Christian world, had been an idle Question, and no small prejudice unto the Christian cause. Especially, these being the chief Heads of what he answers, (1.) That though τὰ αἰσθητὰ σημεῖα, or such miracles as were the objects of our Senses ceased, yet God did still vouchsafe τὰ νοητὰ his efficacious workings on the souls of Christians. And (2.) That *Signs were not intended for Believers, but for Unbelievers*, and then immediately concludes τοῦτο οὖν αἴτιον τὸ μὴ γίνεσθαι σημεῖα νῦν, *this therefore is the cause why Miracles are now ceased.* (2.) Because it was more ordinary in these times to pretend Dreams and Visions, then to speak of any cures performed by prayers put up to Martyrs, as you may see in *Gregory Nyssens* Homily upon the XL Martyrs; and in this Chapter of St. *Austin*: And yet the Fathers do ingenuously confess, and were at last convinced that they were delusions,

* *Quando alibi aliisque narrantur non tanta ea commendat autoritas, ut sine difficultate aut dubitatione credantur quamvis Christianis fidelibus à fidelibus indicentur* Aug. de Civ. Dei. l.22.c.8.p. 209.C. 1.

† Tom. 5. Hom. 88. p. 601. 602.

p. 606.

p. 607.

ſions. *Many, both Prieſts and Idiots,* ſaith *Syneſius, have been found among us* πλαττόμενοί τινες ὀνεί- ρους, ὃς αὐτοὶ καλοῦσιν ἀποκαλύψεις, *feigning ſome Dreams, which they call Revelations:* * *The Dreams or Viſions which have appeared in the ſhape of them that have departed this life at this time, have deceived and corrupted many, there being no ſuch thing,* ſaith *Chryſoſtome.* And that of † *Auſtin* is very pertinent to this purpoſe; "Whom "ſhould I find, that might reconcile me to "thee? Should I have gone unto the Angels "with what Prayer? with what Sacraments? "many endeavouring to return unto thee, and "being not able to do it by themſelves, as I "hear, have tryed theſe things, and have fal- "len into the deſire of curious Viſions, and "were accounted worthy of Illuſions. The ſecond Anſwer is contained in the words of *Auſtin*, that *God may permit ſome wonders to be done by Hereticks, and by Impoſtors, and hath declared that he will do ſo* ||; *this therefore,* ſaith he, *is no confirmation of the truth, nor do theſe Wonders manifeſt the Church is Catholick, wherein they are performed, but the Holy Scriptures: Shew us your Scriptures: Hæc ſunt cauſæ noſtræ documenta, hæc fundamenta, hæc firmamenta.* This anſwer will be ſufficiently confirmed by theſe words of Dr.* *Stillingfleet*: "*That after the true Doctrine is confirmed by Di-* "*vine Miracles, God may give the Devil power to* "*work, if not real Miracles, yet ſuch as men* "*cannot judge by the things themſelves, whether*

Ep. 5. 4. p. 190.

Εἰ γὰρ νῦν ὄνειροι τῶν ἐνθάδε τετελευτηκότων ὄντες πολλοὺς ἐξηπάτησαν καὶ διέφθειραν, οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἐν τοῖς πάλαι γενέσθαι. Tom. 5. p. 256. l. 29. Ed. Savil.

† Aug. Confeſs. l. 10. c. 42.

|| *Quæcunque talia in Catholica fiunt ideo ſunt approbanda quia in Catholica fiunt, non ideo ipſa manifeſtatur Catholica quia hæc in ea fiunt ——utrum ipſa Eccleſiam teneant*; Non niſi Divinarum Scripturarum canonicis libris oſtendant. *Ibid. p.* 117. *A.*

* Orig. Sacræ. lib. 2. cap. 10. §. 6.

" *they be ſo or no; and this for tryal whether we will*
" *forſake the true Doctrine confirmed by greater Mi-*
" *racles, for the ſake of ſuch Doctrines as are con-*
" *contrary thereto, and are confirmed by falſe Pro-*
" *phets, by Signs and lying Wonders: Now in this*
" *caſe our Rule of tryal muſt not ſo much be the Mi-*
" *racles conſidered in themſelves, whether real or*
" *no, as the comparing them with the Miracles*
" *wrought in confirmation of that Doctrine which is*
" *contrary to this, which theſe words tend to the*
" *proving of. Therefore Gods people under the Law*
" *were to examine the drift and ſcope of the Mira-*
" *cles; and if they were intended to bring them to*
" *Idolatry, whatever they were, they are forbidden*
" *to hearken to them, as you may ſee moſt evidently*
" Deut. 13. 1, 2, 3. *So now under the Goſpel,*
" *the worſhip of the true God through Jeſus Chriſt,*
" *and by the Doctrine revealed by him is the Stand-*
" *ard, whereby we ought to judge of all pretenders*
" *unto Miracles: So that let the Miracles be what*
" *they will, if they contradict that Doctrine, which*
" *Chriſt revealed to the World, we are to look upon*
" *them only as tryals of our Faith in Chriſt, to ſee*
" *whether we love him with our whole hearts or no.*
And accordingly we look upon theſe Miracles as tryals whether we will forſake the Head Chriſt Jeſus, and give this worſhip of the Creator to the Creature, and the like; and are ſufficiently warded againſt the force of this aſſault by being told that Antichriſt muſt be uſhered in
2 Theſſ. 2. 9. with *Signs and lying Wonders.*

Secondly, What *Auſtin* ſaith unto the *Donatiſts*, we alſo ſay unto the *Church* of *Rome*, *Shew us your Scriptures for this Invocation*; *hæc ſunt cauſæ noſtræ firmamenta* —— The third Particular contained in this Anſwer is, That *the Holy Spirit hath forewarned us that in the latter times this*

Do-

Doctrine of Damons should prevail: which Doctrine both the ingenious Mr. *Mede*, and * *Epiphanius* do well interpret to be the Doctrine of worshipping the Spirits of dead Men, and by the pertinency of this Sense unto St. *Austins* present subject, we have good reason to conjecture that he approved their Opinion.

* Πληροῦται καὶ ἐπὶ τούτους τὸ ἀποστήσονταί τινες τῆς ὑγιοῦς διδασκαλίας, προσέχοντες μύθοις, καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων ἔσονται γὰρ φησὶ νεκροῖς λατρεύοντες. adv. Antidico marionitas. Hær. 78. §. 23. A.

St. *Austins* second Answer to this Objection is as followeth; " † *Moreover if any person praying in the memorials of Hereticks be heard, it is not for the merit of the place, but of his own desire that he receiveth any good. Do we not read that God himself hearkned to many of those Jews who prayed in the high places, although those places so displeased him, that he rebuked those Kings that suffered them. Whence we may understand that the affection of the Supplicant is more prevailing, then the place of Prayer.* And accordingly we say, That if any person praying to these Saints was heard, it was not for the merit of this prayer considered as directed to the Saints, but for the affection of his heart, and as it will not follow that it was lawful for the Jew to pray in those high places, or for the Christian to pray in the memorials of Hereticks, because that they who prayed there were sometimes heard: So neither doth it follow that it is lawful to pray unto the Saints departed, because of some few instances that they who have thus prayed, have received the desired Blessing.

† *Porrò si aliquis in Hereticorum memoriis orans exauditur, non pro merito loci sed pro merito desiderii sui recipit sive malum sive bonum — nonne legimus ab ipso domino Deo nonnullos exauditos in excelsis montium Judææ: quæ tamen excelsa ità displicebant Deo, ut Reges qui ea non everterent culparentur, & qui everterent laudarentur; unde magis valere petentis affectum, quam petitionis locum.* ib. p. 116. Col. 2. K. L.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, saith St. *Austin*, ‖ *Let them hear what the Pagans tell of the Wonders done by their Gods, and at their Temples; and yet the Gods of the* Heathens *are but* Dæmons: *and therefore many, not only* Catholicks, *but* Pagans, Jewes, *and* Hereticks, *may many wayes be heard, either by those seducing Spirits, which yet do nothing but with Gods permission, or else by God himself, either for castigation of their wickedness, or comfort of their misery, or in admonition of them to pursue eternal safety.* Which Answer also doth suggest these things.

‖ *De visis autem fallacibus legam quæ scripta sunt, & quia ipse Satanas se transfigurat tanquam Angelum lucis, & quia multos seduxerunt somnia sua. Audiant etiam quæ narrant pagani de Templis, & Diis suis mirabiliter vel facta, vel visa, & tamen dii Gentium Dæmonia—— Exaudiuntur ergo multi & multis modis, non solum Christiani Catholici, sed & Pagani, & Judæi, & Hæretici variis erroribus, & superstitionibus dediti, exaudiuntur autem vel ab spiritibus seductoribus, qui tamen nihil faciunt nisi permittantur Deo sublimiter atque ineffabiliter judicante quid cuique tribuendum sit, sive ab ipso Deo, vel ad pœnam malitiæ, vel ad solatium miseriæ, vel ad monitionem quærendæ salutis æternæ.* ib f. B. Col. 2. L. M.

1. That the Argument is vain, because it will serve the *Pagan*, as well as it well serve the *Donatist* or *Roman Catholick*; and proves as much their Invocation of *Dæmons* to be lawful, as the invocation of the Saints departed, which is now practised in the *Church of Rome*. " For, as (*a*) *Tertullian* saith, by Signs, and Miracles, and Oracles, they obtained to be reputed Gods. " (*b*) They often by their skill have cured diseases, and restored to health those that were " sick; what should we partake therefore with " them in their iniquity, God forbid? So *Chrysostome*.

(a) *Quibusdam signis & miraculis, & oraculis fidem divinitatis operatur.* Apol. c. 21. §. 8.

(*b*) Καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι πολλὰ πολλάκις διὰ τῆς αὐτῶν τέχνης νοσήματα ἀπήλασαν, καὶ πρὸς ὑγίειαν τοὺς κάμνοντας ἐπανήγαγον. Τί οὖν; κοινωνῆσαι δεῖ τῆς ἀνεβείας διὰ τοῦτο; μὴ γένοιτο. Tom. 6. p 375 l. 20.

sostome. (c) "The wicked *Dæmons*, saith *Eu-* "*sebius*, counterfeited by working many Mi- "racles, the Souls of them that were deceased, "and thence they were thought worthy to be "celebrated with greater service. (d) *In vain*, say they, *you arrogate so much to Christ, for we have often known that other Gods have given Medicines to, and healed the infirmities of many.* Moreover, these benefits they still pretended to receive by vertue of those Supplications which they offer'd to them. (e) *How many*, saith *Celsus, being troubled, that they had no children, have by them enjoyed their wishes? How many, being maimed in their body's, have been healed by them? Hence* saith (f) *Cecilius, they give us caution in dangers, and medicine in diseases, hope to the afflicted, help to the miserable, comfort in calamities, ease from labours.*

(c) Τὰς δὲ ψυχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐνθέους καὶ ἀσωμάτους δυνάμεις οἱ φαῦλοι δαίμονες καθυπεκρίνοντο διὰ πολλῆς τῆς τερατοποιΐας. *Euseb.* Præpar. Evang. l. 5. c. 2.

(d) *Frustra tantum arrogas Christo cum sæpe alios sciamus & scierimus Deos, & laborantibus plurimis dedisse medicinas, & multorum hominum morbos valetudinésque curasse.* Arnobius l. 1. p. 28.

(e) Πόσοι μὲν ἀπαιδίᾳ δυσφοροῦντες ὧν ἐδεέσθησαν σχόντες, πόσοι σωμάτων πηρώσεις ἰάσθησαν. *Apud Orig. l*, 8. *p.* 407. καὶ δὴ ἐπικαλούντες αὐτοὺς ἰῶνται τῶν μερῶν τὰ παθήματα, *p.* 416.

(f) *Dant cautelam periculis, morbis medelam, spem afflictis, opem miseris, solatium calamitatibus, laboribus levamentum.* Minut. p. 7.

2. This Argument is vain, because it serves the Heretick as well as Catholick. For what can be more glorious then what *Philostorgius* records of (g) *Agapetus, one of his fellow Hereticks,* That *he wrought many miracles, he raised the dead, and healed many that were sick, and converted many*

(g) Περὶ Ἀγαπητοῦ τοῦ συναιρεσιώτου νεκροὺς τὴν αὐτὸν ἀναστῆσαι λέγει καὶ πολλῶν ἄλλων παθῶν φυγαδεύτην γενέσθαι καὶ ἐλατῆρα, οὐμὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ παραδόξων ἄλλων ἔργων δημιουργὸν καὶ πολλοὺς ἐξ ἑλλήνων εἰς τὴν χριστιανισμὸν μετατάξασθαι παρασκευάσαι. *Philost. Hist. Eccl. l* 2. §. 8. *p.* 14.

to

to the Christian Faith. And of *Theophilus*, another of his brother Arrians,* That *his wonders were so great, and such convincing demonstrations of the Christian Faith, as to constrain the obstinacy of the Jews, and Silence all their contradictions.*——

Lastly, Hence we may learn, that although *Austin* should have related some few instances of persons healed by Supplications tendered to the Saints, we cannot thence infer, as *T. G.* doth, that by so doing he commends them, or doth relate them as patterns for our imitation.

* Ἡ τῶν Ἰουδαίων οἰκεῖα ἐπίνοια τοῦ Θεοφίλου παραδόξοις ἔργοις καὶ ἅπαξ καὶ δὶς τὴν εἰς τὸν χριστὸν πίστιν ἄμαχον ἐπιδειξάμενος εἰς σιγὴν μὲν Βαθείαν καὶ ἀκοντὶ ἀντιπλέων κατέδυ. *Idem. l.* 3. § 4. *p.* 27.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

The Contents.

The Judgment of the Fathers proved to be the ſame with that of Proteſtants, becauſe they do aſſert that Prayer muſt be offered unto none but God, and by no other Interceſſor but our Saviour Chriſt. Sect. 1. *And this Aſſertion they prove,* 1. *Becauſe God only can be called good.* 2. *Becauſe he only can anſwer our Petitions,* ibid. 2. *They do affirm, That by addreſſing a Petition to a Saint or Angel, we become guilty of diſtraction from God, and of deſerting our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* Sect. 2. 3. *That to pray unto a Creature, or to that which is no God, is to worſhip it as God, or give that honour to it which is due to God alone.* Sect. 3. 4. *They hence infer that Chriſt is God, and that the Holy Ghoſt is God, becauſe we put up our Petitions to them.* Sect. 4. 5. *Becauſe the invocation of the inferior Heathen Dæmons was by the Fathers cenſured as Idolatry. And there is no deſparity betwixt the invocation of thoſe Dæmons, and that invocation of the bleſſed Martyrs which is now practiſed*

practiſed in the Church of Rome, *ſufficient to acquit the Papiſt from that Guilt, if it be duly charged on the Heathens by reaſon of their Supplications tendred to inferior Dæmons.* Sect. 5. 6. *The Fathers diſpute againſt the Heathens with ſuch Arguments as perfectly deſtroy this practiſe, and confute this Doctrine.* Sect. 6. 7. *Becauſe the ancient Fathers prayed for all the Saints, without exception of Martyrs or Apoſtles, or the bleſſed Virgin.* 8. *Becauſe the Fathers gave no Rules touching the Canonizing of the Saints departed.* ibid.

TO what we have diſcourſed from the holy Scriptures, and from the Principles of Reaſon, we ſhall now add the ſuffrage of thoſe ancient *Fathers* who flouriſhed in the *firſt* and *pureſt Ages* of the *Church*. Who do not only ſay expreſly, that our Prayers ſhould only be directed to God (aſſerting this without thoſe limitations and diſtinctions which are now uſed by the *Church of Rome*) but alſo do it upon the very ſame enducements and motives which Proteſtants are wont to uſe for confirmation of this truth. Moreover, in their conflicts with the Arrians, and other Adverſaries of the Church of *Chriſt*, they uſe thoſe very weapons wherewith we fight againſt the *Church of Rome*, and do pronounce that Doctrine and Practice which that *Church* contends for, to be the giving to the Creature what is due to God.

And firſt, *the Fathers do aſſert that prayer muſt be offered unto none but God, and by no other Interceſſor but our Saviour Chriſt.* When *Celſus* had pronounced

nounced that * *Heathen Dæmons did belong to God, and thence inferred, we should entreat their favour.* *Origen* replys two things. 1. That those *Dæmons* being wicked Spirits could not belong to God. 2. " That this advice of † *Celsus*, to put up our " Petitions to them, was to be utterly rejected, " and by no means allowed by Christians: Be- " cause, God only was to be made the object of " our prayer, nor were we to sollicite any other " than our great High Priest, to offer and present them to the Father. And hence in two *Catena's*, both published by the Doctors of the Church of ‖ *Rome*, we have this free confession of an antient Father *μόνῳ τῷ Θεῷ προσευχόμεθα, We Christians pray to God alone.* And upon this account, they tell us the *Psalmist* uttered this expression, *Attend unto the voice of my petition my King and my God: For unto thee will I pray*; because (a) *Petitions were to be offered unto God alone*, according to that Question of St. *Austin* (b) *to whom else shall I cry but unto thee?* and that expression of (c) *Dracontius esse nihil prorsus se præter ubique rogandum*: that nothing besides God should be invoked. And this assert on they do not barely offer, but also they confirm it by many pregnant Arguments; as first, *He only must be prayed unto, because, he only can be called Good:*

* Δαίμονες εἰσὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο προσευκτέον ἵνα εὐμενεῖς ὦσι. *l.* 8. *p.* 394.

† Ἄπαγε δὲ τὴν τοῦ Κέλσου συμβουλὴν λέγοντος, Προσευκτέον εἶναι δαίμοσι· καὶ οὐδὲ κατὰ τὸ πρόσον ἀκουστέον αὐτῆς· Μόνῳ γὰρ προσευκτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ, καὶ προσευκτέον γὲ τῷ μονογενεῖ καὶ πρωτοτόκῳ πάσης κτίσεως λόγῳ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀξιωτέον αὐτὸν ὡς ἀρχιερέα, τὸν ἐπ' αὐτὸν φθάσασαν ἡμῶν εὐχὴν ἀναφέρειν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ Θεὸν ἡμῶν, καὶ πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ πατέρα τῶν βιούντων κατὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ. *Origen. contra Cels. lib.* 8. *p.* 395.

‖ Nicet. Caten. in Psal. 5.

(a) *Oratio enim soli Deo offertur.* Aurea Catena in 5c. Psal. edit. Venet. Anno 1569. Pag. 53.

(b) *Cui alteri præter te clamabo?* Aug. Confess. lib. 1. cap 5.

(c) L. de Creatione.

(d) *since*

(d) Εἰκότως ὁ γνὸς ὄντως τῷ ἀγαθῷ Θεῷ, περὶ ἀνθρώπων μόνων ἀγαθῶν τὰ μὲν δεῖσθαι, τὰ δὲ παραμένειν εὐχόμενα. ἡμεῖς τε καὶ ἄγγελοι. *Clem. Alexand. Strom. l. 7. p. 721.* (e) Ἀτοπον ἐπὶ τῶν πληρώσαντος καὶ ἐξανδρα καὶ τὴν γὴν-- ὃν-τος μὲ'

(d) *since God alone is good* (saith *Clemens*) *it is reasonable we should sollicite him alone: for the Donation and Continuance of good things.* (2.) because God only is present in all places, and so at hand to hear, and help us wherever we address our prayers to him. *It is an absurdity* (saith (e) *Origen*) *having that God with us, and nigh at hand, who filleth Heaven and Earth, to go about to pray to that which is not omnipresent.* This I confess is spoken to demonstrate, that intercessions were not to be made unto the *Sun* and *Moon* and *Stars*: but then it must be noted that this Father held both *Sun* and *Moon* and *Stars* to be intelligible Creatures, and in this very place asserts, that (f) *they do offer up their Prayer to God,* and from this very Argument concludes, we must not pray to them, *because they pray to him.* Whence it will follow that he conceived them as fit and able to be our Intercessors as the Saints departed, and that it was absurd to pray to any, who themselves properly did pray for us. And (2.) he adds, (g) *if any Christian be not sufficient immediately to direct his Prayers to God, let him address them to the Word of God*; making no mention of an address to be preferred either to Saint, or Angel, or to the *B. Virgin* in this Case. (3.) He adds that put the (h)

ἡμῶν καὶ πλησίον ἡμῶν τυγχάνοντος —— ζητεῖν εὔχεσθαι, τῷ μὴ φθάνοντι ἐπὶ τὰ σύμπαντα. *Orig. contra Celsum lib. 5. pag. 239.*

(f) Πεισθέντες δὲ καὶ αὐτὸν ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην καὶ ἀστέρας εὔχεσθαι τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ, κρίνομεν μὴ δεῖν εὔχεσθαι τοῖς εὐχομένοις. *Id pag. 238.* (g) Κἂν μή τις ἱκανὸς ᾖ δι' ἑαυτοῦ ἥτινος καὶ ὁ τοιοῦτος εὐχέσθω τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *&c. Id ib.* (h) Ἀλλ' ἔστω καὶ κήρυκας αὐτοῦ εἶναι καὶ ἀληθῶς ἐξανίους ἀγγέλους· Πῶς δ' ἂν ἔχοι καὶ ὅσιον τὸν κηρυσσόμενον ὑπ' αὐτῶν Θεὸν, καὶ οὐ τὸν ἀγγελλόμενον μόνον μᾶλλον προσκυνητέον, ἢ τοὺς κήρυκας καὶ ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ. *Id. p. 239.*

Case,

Caſe that Sun, Moon, and Stars were heavenly *Angels*, and *Meſſengers of God, yet were they not to be adored for this, but he whoſe Meſſengers and Angels they were.* Where by the way obſerve, that he inſenſibly ſlides from εὔχεσθαι *to pray*, to προσκυνεῖσθαι which is *to adore*. Whence we may certainly conclude, that in the Judgment of this Father, it was the ſame to pray to any perſon, and to adore that perſon, and that nothing may be invocated, which may not be adored. (Laſtly) it is evident his reaſon will hold good as well againſt addreſſes made to Saints, as to the Sun and Moon, they being neither of them omnipreſent. (3.) They ſay he only muſt be prayed unto, who ſeeth and heareth every where? *Let us conſider* (ſaith (*i*) *Tertullian*) *the Heavenly Wiſdom of our Lord in his Injunction to pray in ſecret, whereby he both requires the Faith of Man, conſiding that God omnipotent both hears and ſees under our Roofs, and in our ſecret Places, and alſo that our Faith be modeſt, ſo that we offer our Religion unto him alone, whom we are confident doth ſee and hear us every where.* And *Chryſoſtom*, upon the ſame Expreſſion, finds fault with thoſe that pray aloud, and bids us Imitate the *Hymues* and *Melodies* of holy *Angels*, who pray with us, although we do not hear them: for, ſaith he, (*k*) "thou doſt not "pray to Man, but to God omnipreſent, to "him that hears before thou ſpeakeſt, to him "that underſtandeth, what the Mind doth not "utter.

(*i*) *De Orat. c.* 1. *Sect.* 8.

(*k*) Οὐ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους εὔχῃ, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν τὸν πάντα χωροῦντα, τὸν πρὸ τοῦ φθέγγεσθαι, τῷ ἀκούοντι, τῷ τὰ ἀφθέγκτα τῆς διανοίας ἐπαΐοντι. *Chryſoſt. Tom.* 2. *Homil. in Matt.* 19. *pag.* 137.

(4.) Becauſe he only can Anſwer our Petitions, and from him only can we obtain what we

desire. * "We beg for all our Emperors long "life, safe Empire, valiant Armies, a faithful Se- "nate, an honest People, and a quiet World, "and whatsoever any man or Emperor could "wish. So *Tertullian*: And then he adds, "These "things I may not pray for from any other "but from him of whom I know I shall obtain "them: because, both it is he who alone is a- "ble to give, and I am he to whom it apper- "taineth to obtain that which is requested, be- "ing his servant who observe him alone. From all which sayings it is evident these antient *Fathers* did not only think as we now do, that all our Intercessions should be made to God, but also that they did it for these very Reasons we alledg *viz.* that he alone is omnipresent, that he alone discerns the secrets of the Heart, that he alone is able to confer the Blessings which we want, and pray for.

* *Precantes sumus pro omnibus Imperatoribus vitam illis prolixam, imperium securum, domum tutam, populum probum, orbem quietum, quæcunque hominis & Cæsaris vota sunt. Hæc ab alio orare non possum, quam à quo me scio consequuturum, quoniam & ipse est, qui SOLUS præstat, & ego sum cui impetrare debetur, famulus ejus qui eum Solum observo.* Tertul. Apol. c. 30. Sect. 2, 3.

(2) The Fathers do affirm, that by addressing a petition to a *Martyr*, *Saint*, or *Angel*, we become guilty of distraction from God, and of deserting our Lord *Jesus Christ*. (l) *We cannot be induced*, saith the Church of *Smyrna*, *to forsake Christ*, *or worship any other Person*; where first it well deserveth to be noted, that what is in the Greek, ἕτερόν τινα σέβειν is in the antient Interpreter of the Acts of *Polycarp*, *Alteri cuiquam Orati-*

(l) Οὐτὲ τὸν Χριστόν ποτε καταλιπεῖν δυνησόμεθα, οὐτὲ ἕτερόν τινα σέβεσθαι· Τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ, υἱὸν ὄντα τοῦ Θεοῦ προσκυνοῦμεν, τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας ὡς μαθητὰς τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ μιμητὰς ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως. *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 4. c. 15. pag. 135.*

onis

onis precem impendere (we cannot pray to any other.) And what the Jews objected; (*that if the Christians could obtain the Martyrs body ἀφέντες τὸ ἐσταυρωμένον τοῦτον ἄρξονται τοῦτους, deserting Christ they would begin to worship him*) is by the *Metaphrast* thus rendred, *huic fundenda esset oratio singulorum*, they would all pray unto him. Now seeing this Translation was of such credit in the *Western Church*, that it was read in their assemblies; it is most certain that Church did antiently conceive (1.) that the Church of *Smyrna* did deny that any genuine Christian would pray to any Saint departed. (2.) That to put up a petition to a Martyr was to renounce their Saviour. And (3.) that to pray to and afford religious worship to a Martyr was the same. And (4.) that we must only put up our petitions to the Son of God; because, he only must be worshipped. Secondly, observe the reason of this assertion of the Church of *Smyrna*; "We cannot worship any "other, *delivered in these words*; For him being "the Son of God we worship, but the Martyrs, "as the Disciples and followers of the Lord, we highly love for their exceeding great affection to their own King and Master. The *Church* of *Rome* could have informed them of a better Reason why they should affect them, (*viz.*) as being *Intercessors*, and *Mediators* for, and *Patrons* of the *Christian Church*, and the *Procurers* of all spiritual Blessings for them. She could have told them it was ignorantly done to comprehend that Service, which was due to the deceased *Martyrs* in this one expression, "We love them worthily: For if the Veneration and Worship of the Saints departed, "nay, the Worship of their very Ashes, hath "been the constant Custom of the whole

Act. Polyc. in Append. Ignat. Usser. p. 27.

" Church of God ; *and if the Invocation of them* " *be that*, which Holy Scripture teacheth, and " the Apoſtles have delivered, and which the " Church of God hath alwaies practiſed, as is delivered in the * *Catechiſm* of the *Church of Rome*, it may be well admired that the Church of *Smyrna* which daily practiſed (ſay they) this veneration and invocation of the holy Martyrs, ſhould, without diſtinction, appropriate all worſhip and adoration to the Son of God, in oppoſition to the Martyrs, and comprehend the Service they performed to the bleſſed *Martyrs* in a word which doth not in the leaſt import the Veneration which they daily practiſed.

Part. 3. c. 2. Sect. 8.

(2.) Obſerve the Reaſon which is given by the Church of *Smyrna* why they could not worſhip any other, *viz. Becauſe they worſhipped the Son of God:* if any worſhip had been then paid to *Martyrs*, or any other Saints departed, by the Church of Chriſt, what could have been more ſtupid than this Way of reaſoning? Now that this Doctrine is introduced into the Church of *Rome* we hear them ſpeaking thus ; † *We worſhip Saints and Martyrs in honour of the Son of God:* So far do they eſteem that honour which they pay to him from being any prejudice unto the Worſhip of thoſe bleſſed Spirits.

† *Tantum abeſt ut Sanctis invocandis Dei gloria minuatur, ut eo maximè augeatur.* Cat. Rom. part 3. c. 2. Sect. 11.

(3.) Obſerve the Argument which the Jews urged to move the Proconſul to retain the body, *viz. That if the Chriſtians could obtain it, it might be feared they would leave Chriſt, and worſhip* Polycarp. The Jews could not be ignorant of what the Chriſtians practiſed in this caſe, by reaſon of thoſe numerous Apoſtates who daily left the Church, and of that liberty they had to come to their Aſſemblies. Had then the *Chriſtians* worſhip-

worshipped other *Martyrs* with Christ, and had they professed to do it for his sake and honour, could this have been objected by the Jews with any sense and reason, that they would quit *Jesus Christ*, that they might worship *Polycarp?* Must they not rather have objected, that with Christ they would worship *Polycarp?* which since they did not, we may well suspect the practice of the *Church* gave them no reason so to do.

Athanasius discoursing upon these words of *Jacob*; *The Angel that delivered me from all evil, defend the Lads*, (which by the *Arians* were urged to the same purpose as they are used by *Roman Catholicks*, viz. to prove that Invocation was not so proper to God, but that it might be used to Creatures, and therefore that it was no evidence that Christ was God) declares, that *Jacob* did not speak of a created Angel: (1.) Because he joyns the Angel with God, and saith, * *The God that fed me; the Angel that delivered me*, which, though it be familiar with the *Roman Catholicks*, he looked upon as an absurd, illegal practice. (2.) Because *no man, deserting of that God that fed him, would ask a blessing for his kindred of the holy Angels:* whence it is evident, that in the judgement of this Father, to pray to holy Angels was to desert the God of Heaven, even when we made our first addresses to him, as here *Jacob* did.

|| St. *Hilary* the Deacon saith, That the Ido-

* Ὃν τῶν κτισθέντων, καὶ τὴν φύσιν ἀγγέλων ὄντων ἕνα, συνῆπται τῷ κτίσαντι αὐτοὺς Θεῷ. οὐδὲ ἀφεὶς τὸν τρέφοντα αὐτὸν Θεὸν παρ' ἀγγέλου τὴν εὐλογίαν ἤτει τοῖς ἐγγόνοις. ἀλλ' εἴρηκως, Ὁ ῥυόμενός με ἐκ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἔδειξε μὴ τῶν κτισθέντων τινὰ ἀγγέλων, ἀλλὰ τὸν Λόγον εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὃν τῷ πατρὶ συνάπτων ἤυχετο. *Athanas. Orat.4. contra Arianos. p.260.*

|| *Sanctus Hilarius. August. contra lit. pelag. l.4 c.4. M.*

† *Solent tamen pudorem paſſi negligi Dei miſerâ uti excuſatione, dicentes per iſtos poſſe ire ad Deum, ſicut per comites pervenitur ad Regem. Age nunquid tam demens eſt aliquis, aut ſalutis ſuæ immemor, ut honorificentiam Regi vindicet comiti; eum de hâc re ſi qui etiam tractare fuerint inventi, jure ut rei damnantur Majeſtatis? & iſti ſe non putant reos, qui honorem nominis Dei*

laters made uſe of this † *miſerable excuſe for themſelves, that by thoſe inferior Deities they worſhipped, they went to God himſelf, as we go to the King by his Courtiers. But,* ſaith he, *is any man ſo mad, or regardleſs of himſelf, to give the Honour due to the King to any of his Courtiers, which if a man does he is condemned for Treaſon? And yet they think themſelves not guilty, who give the Honour due to Gods Name to a Creature, and forſaking God adore his fellow-ſervants, as though any thing greater than that were reſerved for God himſelf. But therefore we go to a King by his Officers and Servants, becauſe the King is but a man, who knows not of himſelf whom to imploy in his publick affairs. But to procure the favour of God, from whom nothing is hid, (for he knoweth the merits,* or works, *of all men) we need no ſpokeſman, but a devout mind; for whereſoever ſuch a one ſhall ſpeak unto him, he will anſwer him.* Where we have theſe three things conſiderable: 1. That to go unto God by a Creature, as we go to earthly Princes by their Miniſters, is to be guilty of Rebellion againſt God, by giving of his Honour to a Creature, and by worſhipping the Miniſter as if he were the King. 2. That this is to deſert the God of Heaven. And (3.) That by doing thus, we do aſcribe unto our fellow-ſervants as great Honour as we can give to God himſelf. To this *T. G.* replies; p. 370 "Firſt, That this Author ſpeaks of "thoſe who gave the Honour due to God, to "a Creature, and forſaking God adored their

deferunt Creaturæ, & relicto Domino conſervos adorant; quaſi ſit aliquid plus, quod ſervetur Deo, nam & ideo ad Regem per Tribunos aut comites tur, quia homo utique eſt Rex, & neſcit quibus debeat rempublicam credere. Ad Deum autem (quem utique nihil latet, omnium enim merita novit) promerendum ſuffragatore non opus eſt, ſed mente devota. Ubicunque enim talis locutus fuerit ei, reſpondebit illi.

"fellow-

"fellow-ſervants; very true: But then he adds, That he is guilty of all this, who goes to God by a Creature, as a man would recommend himſelf to the King by his Miniſter, which is the daily practice of the *Romaniſt*. This plaiſter therefore doth not heal the wound, but make it wider.

2. "As he who only makes uſe of a Courti-
"er to recommend him to the King, doth not
"give the Honour due to the King to any of
"his Courtiers, ſo neither do Catholicks give
"the Honour due to God, to the Saints, who
"only require the favour of their prayers to
"God, ſo *T. G.* Repl. This is as if he P. 371.
ſhould have ſaid, *St. Hilary thou lyeſt*: For he expreſly ſaith, That to recommend our ſelves to God by a Creature, as we do to the King by his Courtiers, is *honorificentiam Regis vindicare Comiti*. For as he who ſets up a Vice-Roy or ſubordinate King in any Commonwealth, and gives the Honour of a Vice-Roy to him without the Kings Commiſſion, doth give that Honour to him which is due only to the King, and ought to be eſteemed as a violater of his Kingly Power; ſo muſt he alſo be eſteemed, who having no Commiſſion from God and Chriſt, ſets up ſubordinate Mediators, and Maſters of Requeſt to God. 3. *T. G.* doth charge Ibid.
the Doctor with *a terrible blunder*; becauſe he rendreth, *Suffragatore non opus eſt*, We need not any to recommend us to his favour. *Repl.* 1. This is a Calumny, for what he rendreth thus, is *Suffragatore non opus eſt ad promerendum Deum*, which cannot otherwiſe be rendred. *T. G.*'s Tranſlation is confuted by the Reaſon following, which (as the Doctor doth tranſlate the words) is this, *The devout perſon needs no ſpokeſ-*

man to obtain Gods favour, for if he ſpeak himſelf, God will be ſure to anſwer him. But according to *T. G.*'s it will run thus, *We need not any to inform God, that ſo we may procure his favour, but a devout mind*; which is ſufficiently ridiculous. 3. To this Interpretation of *Peroon Du Moulin* anſwers thus, "To this word the Cardinal giveth an "abſurd Interpretation, ſaying, that it ſignifieth a Counſellor. Every one that hath "ſome taſte of the Latin Tongue will ſmile at "this, knowing that this word was never taken in that ſenſe. The votes of every Roman "Citizen in the *Comitia* or City Meetings were "called *Suffragia*, and he who helped or favoured any with his vote, was called his Suffragator. Now it is clear, that the Author "of this Book ſpeaks of Colonels and Governors, or *Comites*, which are uſed as Interceſſors, not as Counſellors.

Novelty of Pop. p. 420

But *T. G.* doth object againſt St. *Hilary*; "If a devout mind be enough to recommend us "to the favour of God, what need we the "prayers of others, or the interceſſion of "Chriſt? What *Hilary* would anſwer I am not able to divine; but if he were alive, he might well wonder, that ſpeaking againſt them, *Qui honorem nominis Dei deferunt Creaturæ*, he ſhould be thought to exclude Chriſt Jeſus, whom he ſo often denies to be a Creature. 2. As to the prayers of others, St. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith the ſame with *Hilary* in very many places. * "When "we have ſuit unto men, ſaith he, it falleth "out oft-times, that we cannot go ſtraight "unto the Lords themſelves, and preſent our "gift unto them, and ſpeak with them, but it "is neceſſary for us firſt to procure the favour "of their Miniſters, and Stewards, and Offi-

"cers,

* *Chryſoſt. in Matth. T. 7. p. 768*

"cers, both with praying, and using all other "means unto them, and then by their mediati- "on to obtain our request. But with God it "is not thus: For there is no need of Inter- "cessors for the Petitioners; neither is he so "ready to give a gracious answer being en- "treated by others, as by our own selves "praying unto him. And again, † With "God there is no such matter, without an In- "tercessor he is entreated, it sufficeth only "that thou cry in thine heart. Lastly, ‖ With "God (saith he) thou hast need of no Inter- "cessors; but although thou be alone, and "hast no patron, thou by thy self praying un- "to God shalt certainly obtain thy request. "He useth not to yield so soon, being prayed "unto by others for us, as when we our selves "do pray unto him, although we be repleniſh- "ed with a thousand evils. * Thus did he deal "with the Woman of *Canaan*: When *Peter* and "*James* came for her, he did not yield, but "when she her self did remain, he presently "gave that which was desired. All this, and much more to the same effect, we find in *Chryſoſtom*; and yet in his fifth Homily upon the first of *Matthew*, exhorting us to pray † *by our ſelves, rather than by others*, and giving us examples of many, for whom the prayers of their good friends that lived with them, prevailed not; and the example of this Woman, who by her self prevailed, when *James* and *Peter* could not: He adds, οὐ ταῦτα λέγω ἵνα μὴ ἱκετεύωμεν τοὺς ἁγίους, (i. e.) *I ſpeak not this that we ſhould not requeſt the prayers of holy men*, (i. e.) of those we do converse with here on earth, as the examples mentioned do interpret it, *but to prevent our ſloth*. The like might *Hilary* have answered to

† *Serm. 7. de pœnit. T. 6. Ed. Savil. p. 802.*

‖ *Serm. de profectu Evang. To. 5. f. 416.*

* *Serm. in Pſal. 4. p. 524.*

† δι' ἑαυτῶν μᾶλλον ἢ δι' ἑτέρων. *To. 2. p. 34.*

T. G.'s

T. G's. objection. Lastly, that he might give some colour to his exposition of the words of *Hilary*, he very disingenuously and lamely represents his Argument, for he makes it to be only this, *that because nothing is hid from God, there is no need of a suffragator.* Whereas his Argument runs thus, *to make him favourable who is acquainted with the merits* (or the works) *of all men, there is no need of any Suffragator*: now I conceive it is as well the business of an Intercessor, as of a Counsellor, to plead the merits, or good works, of him for whom he intercedes.

4. When (*a*) *Celsus* had affirmed, that by giving worship to those *Dæmons* which were subject to the highest God, he would not be offended whose Subjects they were: *Origen* replies, (*b*) *That he who doth not any work that is grateful to the Dæmons*, ὑπεραναβαίνει τὴν δουλείαν, *doth ascend above the worship of them. And that he ascends above the portion of them, who by St.* Paul *are called Gods*, (i. e.) the Angels, *who, as they do, or any other way doth look, not at the things*

(*a*) Τῷ ἐν τι τῶν τοῦ μεγάλου θεραπεύειν φίλον καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἐκείνῳ ποιεῖν, *l.* 8. *p.* 381.

(*b*) Ὑπεραναβαίνει δὲ τὴν παρὰ πᾶσι δαιμονίοις δουλείαν ὁ μηδὲν ἔργον δαιμονίοις φίλον ποιῶν· καὶ ὑπεραναβαίνει τὴν μερίδα τῶν παρὰ Παύλου λεγομένων εἶναι Θεῶν· ὁ σκοπῶν, εἴτε ὡς ἐκεῖνοι, εἴθ' ὅπως πότε ἔχει τὰ πράγματα, οὐ τὰ βλεπόμενα, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα· καὶ ὁρῶν τίνα τρόπον καὶ ἡ τῆς κτίσεως ἀποκαραδοκία τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται, &c. εὐφημῶν τὴν κτίσιν, καὶ βλέπων τίνα, τρόπον ἐλευθερωθήσεται πᾶσα ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς, καὶ καταντήσεται εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐ πρεσπᾶται πρὸς τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἄλλῳ τινὶ δουλεύειν μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ πρὸς τὸ δυσὶ Κυρίοις δουλεύειν. οὐ στάσεως οὖν φωνὴ ἐπὶ τοῖς νοήσασι τὰ τοιαῦτα, καὶ μὴ θέλουσι δουλεύειν πλείοσι κυρίοις· διὰ τοῦτο ἀρκομένοις Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ —— *Orig. contra Celsum. l.* 8. *p.* 382.

which

which are seen, but which are not seen; and who beholding that the creature waiteth for the revelation of the Sons of God, &c. doth εὐφημεῖν τὴν κτίσιν, (i. e.) *doth speak well of, or wish well to them, and understanding that the creature shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the liberty of the Sons of God, is not himself distracted, or withdrawn from God, to worship any other with him, nor doth endure to serve two Lords. Wherefore,* saith he, *it is not a seditious speech of those, who being well content with one Lord Jesus Christ, do think and say,* μὴ θέλουσι δουλεύειν πλείοσι κυρίοις, *they will not give Dulia to more Lords.* Now that the strength and pertinency of this Discourse may be conspicuous to the Reader, let it be observed that (*b*) *Origen* conceived this passage of St. *Paul*, which speaks of that *corruption* and *vanity* to which * *the Creature was unwillingly subjected*, was to be understood as well of *Angels*, as of inferior Creatures, as is apparent both from his Comment on the place: And from his first Book *de Principiis, Chap.* 7, 8. so that his meaning in these words must undeniably be this, the Christian in his Devotions doth ascend above the Angels, and is not so distracted and withdrawn from God, as to worship Angels with him; but maketh God and his Son Jesus Christ the only objects of his Worship. 2. (*c*) *We Christians,* saith he, *do not decline the worship of any other with God, and by his word, because we think,*

(b) *Eam verò Origenis doctrinam fuisse, quod omnes Angeli sublimésque virtutes in dolore, & gemitibus sint antequam nos penitus liberemur, non dubium est legenti commentarium ejus hoc loco, & ea quæ scribit libr. 1. de principiis, c.* 7, 8. Esth. in locum. Vide Not. Spenceri. in l. 5. contr. Celsum. p. 63.

(*b*) —οὐδ' ὡς βλαπτομένου τοῦ Θεοῦ (ὡς δοκεῖ βλάπτεσθαι ἄνθρωπος ὑπὸ τοῦ καὶ ἄλλῳ σὺν αὐτῷ δουλεύοντος) ἐκ κλίνομεν τὸ δουλεύειν ἄλλῳ τινὶ, ἢ τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτοῦ. ἀλλ' ἵνα ἡμεῖς μὴ βλαβῶμεν ἑαυτοὺς χωρίζοντες τῆς ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεοῦ μερίδος. *Orig. contra Celsum l.* 8. *p.* 383.

God can be hurt, as a man may, by ſerving of another with him, but that we may not hurt our ſelves, by ſeparating of our ſelves from the Portion of God.

(d) — μᾶλλον ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τῷ διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς θεραπεύειν. Id. p. 384.

(e) — Παῦλός φησι — Ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ. Id. p. 384.

(f) — ἀναιρεῖται ἡ πρὸς τὸν ἕνα θεὸν ὁ ἀχώριστος καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως, καὶ ἀμερίστως αὐτὸ σέβων διὰ τοῦ μόνου θεραπεύεσθαι αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ, &c. Id. ibid.

(g) Ἵν' ὁ μόνα τὰ θεοσυνάωτα ὡς θεὸς παρὰ πᾶσι ἐπὶ γῆς ἐνεργῇ ὑπὲρ ἀξιῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ καθ' ἃς φασὶν αἱ χρεῖαι θεός. Id. ib.

(h) Aug. Serm. 17 de verbis Apoſt. * p. 357.

(3.) *He adds*, that (d) *we have better reaſon to ſerve God only by his Son, by whoſe conduction we are brought to God; than to ſerve two Lords*, or perform what *Celſus* had affirmed to be grateful to God: *(viz.)* the worſhipping of thoſe who were his Subjects, and belonged to him (4.) He affirms, that when St. (e) *Paul* aſſerted that *to us there is but one God the Father, from whom are all things, he ſpeaks there of himſelf, and of all them who do aſcend unto the higheſt God of Gods, and Lord of Lords*, which perſons he deſcribes by theſe three Notes, 1. That they were ſuch as (f) *inſeparably and undividedly worſhip this God of Gods by Jeſus Chriſt.* 2. That they were ſuch *as came unto him by Chriſt alone.* 3. That they were ſuch as ſo aſcended to him, as *to* (g) *tranſcend even theſe bleſſed Spirits which are in Scripture called Gods.* 5. He comprehends the Honor which the Chriſtians gave unto the Angels, in the words *bene precatur creaturæ*, ſaith the Latine. Whereas St. (h) *Auſtin* teleth us, *It is an injury to pray for them, unto whoſe prayers we ought to be commended.* To theſe citations, x, y returns this Anſwer, *viz.* * "That the worſhip which *Origen* here contends, is not to

be

"be given to Angels is Divine Worſhip, pro-
"per to God alone. But 1. this Reply makes
Origen diſpute impertinently, and to ſay no-
thing to the purpoſe. For *Celſus* only did con-
tend for this, (*i*) *That together with the higheſt
God, inferior Beings might be worſhipped as his Sub-
jects.* "No, ſaith St. *Origen*, the Chriſtian go-
"eth immediately to God by Chriſt, he comes
"unto him by no other, he aſcends above the
"ſervice of *Dæmons* and of *Angels*, and doth
"not ſuffer himſelf to be diſtracted from God,
"ſo as to worſhip any other with him. If he
intended to aſſert the *Chriſtians* did not wor-
ſhip *Angels* or *Dæmons* with him, as his Subjects,
the Diſcourſe is pertinent, if he intended only
to affirm that Chriſtians did not worſhip Angels
or Dæmons with him, as his Peers, this doth
not hinder the worſhip of them, as his Subjects,
according to the plea of *Celſus*. 2. When he
affirms "that Chriſtians did aſcend, or go to
"God, only by Jeſus Chriſt, having no other
"προσαγωγεῦς Conciliator, or Interceſſor to
"give acceſs unto him, when he affirms all this,
in oppoſition unto that of *Celſus*, that *it would
be grateful to God to worſhip them who did belong un-
to him*, when he aſſerts "that Chriſtians did aſ-
"cend, or go to God, ἀμερίστως καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως,
"without dividing of their ſervice betwixt him
"and any other, and more particularly, that
"in aſcending to God they overlooked the
"bleſſed Angels, which are in Scripture cal-
"led Gods, and that both Reaſon and St. *Paul*
"had taught them ſo to do. What greater e-
vidence can be deſired to prove that the Chri-
ſtians of his time did never call upon the Saints
and Angels to be their Advocates with God?
or tender any part of their Religious Worſhip
to

(*i*) Τιμῶν τὶς καὶ σέβων, φησὶ, τοὺς ἐκείνου πάντας, οὐ λυπεῖ τὴν Θεόν, οὗ πάντες εἰσίν. *Orig. l.* 8 *p.* 381.

† p. 358. to them, or think it reasonable to worship them,
*l. 8. p. 384 because they did belong unto God? 3. If this
had been the mind of *Origen*, is it not to be
wondred that he makes no distinction of the
kinds of Worship, or of the parts and actions
of it: but absolutely and indefinitely pronoun-
ceth, that *to worship any other with God, is to be
distracted from him, and that Christians undevided-
ly did worship God by Jesus Christ?* For if the
Christians of his time did also worship Saints
and Angels, and go to God not only by Christ
Jesus, but by them, these sayings, without li-
mitation, are both absolutely false, and perfect
condemnations of the Churches practise. But yet
T. G. † assures us, "*It is plain*, Origen *speaks only*
"*of divine worship*, and not of such an inferior
"worship of which Creatures are capable upon
"account of their holiness or relation to God,
"1. From the Reply which *Origen* gave to that
"evasion of *Celsus*, *viz.* that none were to be
"honoured *For Gods*, but those to whom the
"Supream God doth communicate it. Repl.
Since then, the plea of *Celsus* was that we ought
to worship ἔν τι τῶν τοῦ μεγάλου, *the Relations of God*,
what an Impertinent was *Origen* to speak only
of an other matter? 2. The strength of this ci-
tation entirely depends upon the words, *For
Gods*, which *T. G.* disingenuously adds unto
the words of *Celsus* *, which are only these, οὐδ'
ἔξεστι τιμᾶσθαι οὐδενὶ ὅτῳ μὴ ἐξ ἐκείνου δέδοται, it is not
lawful to worship any but those to whom he
granteth to be honoured: But (3.) he expres-
ly adds, that he speaks of the worship of *the
Gods*, or *the Dæmons*, or *the Heroes*, (k) *Let us*

(k) Καὶ πυθώμεθα τοῦ κέλσου περὶ τῶν τιμωμένων ὡς Θεῶν, ἢ δαιμόνων, ἢ καὶ ἡρώων. ὅτι πόθεν ὦ τοῦτος, ἀποδεικνύναι ἔχεις, ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τούτοις δέδοται τὸ τιμᾶσθαι; τιμᾶται γοῦν ὡς πρὸ βραχέως ἔλεγες ᾧ κέλσε, τὰ Ἀδριανοῦ παιδικά, καὶ οὐ δὴ τοῦ ἐρεῖς. ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ δέδοται τὸ τιμᾶσθαι ὡς Θεῷ τῷ Ἀντινόῳ. τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐρούμεν, ἀπαιτοῦντες ἀπόδειξιν περὶ τοῦ δεδόσθαι αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀπὶ πᾶσι Θεοῦ τὸ τιμᾶσθαι. *l.* 8. *p.* 384.

ask

ask Celsus, saith he, *concerning those that are worshipped either as Gods, or Dæmons, or Hero's, whence he is able to demonstrate that God hath granted to them to be honoured.* And then having produced *Alcinous* as an instance of the first kind, he asks how it can be demonstrated that it was given to him to be worshipped *as a God*; and then he adds, *this Question I would ask* περὶ τῶν ἄλλων, *i. e. of the Dæmons and the Heroes.* Then he proceeds to prove that τὸ τιμᾶσθαι, *to be honoured*, was a thing granted to *Christ*, which he confirmeth from that passage of St. *John*, that *all should honour the Son as they honour the Father: i. e.* as truly, but not equally, that being inconsistent with *Origens* opinion, as you will presently perceive. Obj. "When *Celsus* objects, that by the same "rule that Christians gave honour to Christ, "he thought they might give it to inferiour "Deities, the account which *Origen* gives of "the worship which Christians attribute to the "Son, (*viz.* because it is said, *I and my Father* "*are one*) makes it yet more evident that he "speaks of Divine Worship. Answ. In the close of this Argument we have the same cheat repeated which I observed before, for he expressly saith, that *Celsus objected that they worshipped Christ for God.* Which is not only false, but flatly contradictory unto the very words of the Objection, *viz.* (*l*) *that if the Christians worshipped nothing else besides God, they might seem reasonable in their contempt of others, but when they do excessively extoll with honour him who was of late original, and yet believe that they do not offend against*

T. G. p. 358.

(*l*) Ἐι μὲν δὴ μηδένα ἄλλον ἐθεράπευον οὗτοι πλὴν ἕνα Θεὸν, ἦν ἄν τις αὐτοῖς ἴσως πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους ἀπενὴς λόγος· νῦν δὲ τὸν ἔναγχος φανέντα τοῦτον ὑπερθρησκεύουσι, καὶ ὅμως οὐδὲν πλημμελεῖν νομίζουσι περὶ τὸν Θεὸν, εἰ καὶ ὑπηρέτης αὐτοῦ θεραπευθήσεται. *Celsus apud Orig. l.* 8. *p.* 385.

God

God by reverencing of his Minister, they are unreasonable: Whence evident it is, that *Celsus* did not think they worshipped him *as God*, but as the *Minister of God*, and one besides God. 2. Hence it is also evident, that *Celsus* did not contend for Divine Worship to be given to his Heroes, but only that they might be worshipped *as the Ministers of God*. And lastly, it is evident that (*m*) *Origen* by that expression, *I and my Father are one*, did not intend to argue the Unity of *Essence*, but of *affection* only betwixt God and Christ, as in this very place he doth distinguish, nor yet to say our Saviour was that God who was the Lord of all, for this (*n*) *expresly he denies*. And so this Answer can be no evidence that he speaks of Worship properly Divine: But if we do at last admit it, what Argument is more ridiculous than this, *Origen denies that there is the same reason to give honour to Christ and to inferiour Damons, Because, Christ is God, therefore he only doth deny the attributing of Divine Worship to them*: For should a *Roman Catholick* object against us in the words of *Celsus*, *by the same Rule that we Protestants give honour to Christ, we may give it unto Saints departed*, and should the *Protestant* answer, *No*; *Because Christ is God*, could it be thence inferred that *Protestants* denyed to Saints departed that honour only which is called *Latria*, but did allow that kind of worship which is called *Dulia*.

(*m*) Ἐι δὲ τίς ἐκ τούτων περιεσπαθήσεται, μὴ πὴ αὐτομολοῦμεν πρὸς τοὺς ἀναιροῦντας δύο εἶναι ὑποστάσεις πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν ἐπιστεύσατο τῷ, ἦν δὲ πάντων τῶν πιστευσάντων ἡ καρδία καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μία, ἵνα θεωρήσῃ τὸ ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἓν ἐσμεν. *l.* 8. *p.* 386.

(*n*) ἔστω δὲ τινὰς ὡς ἐν πλήθει πιστευόντων, καὶ δεχομένων διαφωνίαν διὰ τὴν προπέτειαν ὑποτίθεσθαι τὴν Σωτῆρα εἶναι τὴν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεὸν· ἀλλ' οὔτι γε ἡμεῖς τοιοῦτον, οἱ πειθόμενοι αὐτῷ λέγοντι ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας μὲ, μείζων μοῦ ἐστι. ib. *p.* 387.

To

"To pray unto a Creature, or that which is not God, is in the Language of the the anti-"ent Fathers to worship it as God, or give that "honour to it, which is due to him alone; "is it not the extreamest ignorance, *saith* **Cle-"mens*, to ask of them who are no Gods, as if "they were Gods; and of this imputation he gives two accounts. 1. *That seeing God alone is good, he only should be called upon.* 2. *That prayer is a discourse with God. We find in Scripture* (saith (*a*) *Origen*) *That Angels are sometimes stiled God, but notwithstanding that these Gods do also minister, and bring the gifts of God unto us, we must not worship them* ἀντὶ Θεοῦ *in place of God, for all our prayers and supplications* (by whatsoever name we call them, for he mentions all the Kinds of Prayer,) *they must be all sent up to God by that high Priest, who is above all Angels, and is God.* Why so I pray you, but that all prayer is worship which alone belongs to God, and Jesus Christ? And therefore to offer it to any Creature, or by any other Mediator, is to ascribe that to him which is due to God alone: had he been of the Church of *Rome* he must have said with them, that notwithstanding you have that High Priest, yet may you send up your Petitions to the *Saints* and *Angels*, this is an honour to him not an Encroachment upon the office of this great High Priest; it is confessed you must not worship them instead of God, but notwithstanding you may put up to

Arg. 3.

* Ἐσχάτη δὲ ἀμαθίᾳ παρὰ τῶν μὴ Θεῶν ὡς Θεῶν αἰτεῖσθαι. *Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 7. p. 721. D.*

(*a*) Τούτους δὲ ἀγγέλους ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔργου αὐτῶν μεμαθηκότες καλεῖν, εὐρίσκομεν αὐτοὺς, διὰ τὸ Θείους εἶναι, καὶ Θεοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ποτὲ ὀνομαζομένους γραφαῖς· ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥστε προστάσσεσθαι ἡμῖν τοὺς διακονοῦντας, καὶ φέροντας ἡμῖν τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, σέβειν καὶ προσκυνεῖν. *Orig. contra Cels. l. 5. p. 233.*

Πᾶσαν μὲν γὰρ δέησιν, καὶ προσευχὴν, καὶ ἔντευξιν, καὶ εὐχαριστίαν, ἀναπεμπτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων Ἀγγέλων ἀρχιερέως ἐμψύχου λόγου καὶ Θεοῦ. *Id. ib.*

them *Supplications*, *Prayers*, *Thanksgiving*, *Intercessions*, you may say unto them *Pater noster*, and ask all temporal and eternal blessings of them, provided you do not pray unto them with absolute, terminative, and sacrificial Prayer, distinctions which in reference to this matter, the Fathers knew but little off.

Arg. 4. The Fathers hence conclude that Christ is God, and that the Holy Spirit is God, because, we put up our Petitions to them, and because that they are present to relieve us, being called upon. (*b*) "If Christ were only man how comes "he to be every where present when he is in"voked, since to be omnipresent is the proper"ty of God, and is not competent to humane "nature? If Christ was only man, why is a man "invoked in our Prayers, as if he were a Medi"ator? for the Invocation of a man is (*by Chri*"*stians*) judged inefficacious to the obtaining "of Salvation, so *Novatian*: It was so by the antient Christians, but is it so esteemed by the Church of *Rome*? Is not the blessed *Virgin* by them styled (*c*) *Salus hominum*, or the *Salvation of mankind*? Do they not say that (*d*) *God will certainly confer eternal Life on them that worship her*? Do they not bid the (*e*) *Guardian Angel* say unto their *Souls*, *I am thy Salvation*? It is written, saith *Athanasius*, *be thou to me a God*, *Protector*, *and an house of refuge that thou mayst save me*: *which words if Arians conceive to have been spoken of the Son*, (*f*)

(*b*) *Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo adest ubique invocatus, cum hæc humanæ naturæ non sit, sed Dei, ut ubique esse omni loco possit?* Novat. de Trinitate c. 14. p. 707.

Si homo tantummodo Christus, cur homo in Orationibus Mediator invocetur, cum Invocatio hominis ad præstandam Salutem inefficax judicetur. Novatian. ibid.

(*c*) *Ave salus hominum.* Prosa. Miss. f. 35. *B.* (*d*) Ibid. fol. 30.

(*e*) *Missa in Honorem proprii Angeli.* f. 16.

(*f*) ——— ἐπιγνώτωσαν ὅτι μὴ ὄντα γνήσιον ἀυτὸν ἐξῆν βοηθὸν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ὄχυρον καταφυγὴν διάγειν. *Contr. Ar. Orat. p.* 369.

let them know that (Christians or) *Holy Persons do not Petition any thing that was begotten to be an helper to them or a house of Refuge.* What are they then who do declare that it is good and profitable (g) *ad eorum opem auxiliumque confugere* to fly for refuge to their help and aid, whose daily practise is *to fly unto the blessed Virgin,* (h) *ab eâque opem & auxilium implorare, i.e.* and to petition her to be our helper? who do advise us (i) *to fly under her refuge for the pardon of our sin?* Lastly, who say unto their Guardian Angel, (k) *Arise O Angel to my help. Origen* lay's down this as a most certain Rule, (l) *That to invoke the name of God, and to adore him is the same:* Whence he infers *that as Christ may be invocated, so also must he be acknowledged to be God:* and he adds, that *when Saint Paul doth mention those that in all places call upon the name of Christ, he proves the same.*

(g) Concil. Trid. Sess. 25.

(h) Catech. Rom. Par. 4. c. 5. Sect. 8.

(i) *Sub Matris refugio fuge causa veniæ.* Prosa. Miss. f. 33. B. 34. A.

(k) *Exurge Angele in adjutorium meum.* Miss. in Hon. Pr. Angel. f. 16.

(l) *Sed in Principio Epistolæ quam ad Corinthios scribit, ubi dicit cum omnibus qui invocant nomen domini Iesu Christi in omni loco ipsorum & nostro eum cujus nomen invocatur Deum Iesum Christum esse pronunciat: Si ergò & Enos, & Moses, & Samuel invocabant Dominum, & ipse exaudiebat eos sine dubio Christum Iesum Dominum invocabant, & si invocare Domini nomen, & adorare Deum unum atque idem est, sicut invocatur Christus, & adorandus est Christus.* Orig. l. 8. in Epist. ad Rom. c. 10.

Having thus manifested from the judgment of the ancient Fathers that invocation is a part of worship proper to God, and that it cannot be ascribed to Saints departed without Idolatry, much less to the inferior Heathen *Demons:* We shall subjoyn what Dr. *St.* affirms, *viz.* That there Pag. 145.
"being other intermediate beings between the "supreme God, and men whose office, as the "Heathens did conceive, was this, to carry the "prayers of men to God, and to bring down "help from him to them, they thought it very

" fitting to addreſs their ſolemn ſupplications " unto them, this (I ſay) being ſo, there was the " very ſame cauſe in debate betwixt the an- " cient Fathers and the Heathens, vvhich is be- " tween us and the Church of *Rome*. Here *T.G.* ſwells and cryes out ὦ κατάρατε: this is *a moſt injurious Calumny and ſuch as ſcarcely ever dropt from the pen of the greateſt enemies of Chriſtianity:* So he, this being his continual Cuſtom to begin with falſe and diſingenuous accuſations, and to confirm them by moſt impertinent and weak diſcourſes. We therefore will a little draw the paralel, and then proceed to anſwer his impertinencies.

(m) *Oratio portigitur alicui dupliciter. Uno modo quaſi per ipſum impleanda. Alio modo ſicut per ipſum impetranda. Primo quidem modo ſoli Deo Orationem porrigimus: quia omnes orationes noſtræ ordinari debent ad gratiam & gloriam conſequendam, quæ ſolus Deus dat. Secundum illud* Pſal. 83. *Gratiam & Gloriam dabit Dominus. Sed Secundario modo orationem porrigimus Angelis & hominibus* —— Aq. 2 2æ. q. 83. Art. 4.

First then (m) *Aquinas* thus propounds the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, touching the Invocation of departed Spirits; a prayer may be directed to a perſon ſo *as that we do requeſt him to fulfil, and by himſelf accompliſh our deſires, and thus we pray to God alone, or ſo as that we do ſollicite him to beg or to obtain them for us, and thus we pray to Saints and Angels*; now this is that very Office which the *Platoniſts* aſcribed to their *Damons*; " They " ſaith* *St. Auſtin*, bring the prayers of men unto " the Gods, and what they beg and do obtain, " *quæ poſcunt impetrata* they bring back to men. And again, "They think them ſo to intermediate " betwixt God and men, as that they carry our " deſires hence, *illinc referunt impetrata*, and from " thence bring back what they have obtained. Hence are they often ſtiled by them *Advocates* and *Mediators*, *Interceſſors*, and *Pararii i.e.* the obtainers of our Suits.

* Auguſt. de C.D. l.8. c.18.

2. On

2. On this account they thought it reasonable to honor them with supplications. "*Plato*, saith *Ficinus*, subjected the whole number of "Gods unto one King, who as he pleased did "command them all, and he commanded that the "chief God should be worshiped for himself, "the other who are also called Gods by participation to be loved as likest to him, and to "be honoured as his Vicars, and to be addressed "to as to reconcilers. And *Plato* hath himself determined, (*n*) *That they ought to be honoured with our Prayers, by reason of their laudable Province:* which he saith is double. 1. (o) *To be our Interpreters to God.* 2. *To carry up the Prayers and Sacrifices of men to God, and to bring back the commands and answers of God to them.* (p) *We ought to pray unto them to be propitious to us*, so *Celsus*. 3. They did not think them to be Gods properly so called, but only the *ministers* and *servants* of *God*, as I have proved above. † *All things are done*, saith *Apuleius, by the will, majesty, and authority of the heavenly beings, but by the ministry, work, and obsequiousness of the Dæmons.* Hence do they stile them, *virtutes & ministeria Dei magni* ἄγγελοι *i.e.* Gods

* Ficinus *tradit* Platonem *universam Deorum Synagogam unico Regi subdere prout vult singulis imperanti, Jubere primum Deum adori propter seipsum, sequentes vero, qui participes ejus Dii quoque dicuntur amari tanquam illi similiores, honorari etiam ut Vicarios, imo & advocari tanquam Conciliatores.*

(*n*) ——μετὰ δὲ τούτους καὶ ὑπὸ τούτοις ἕξης Δαίμονας· ἀέριον δὲ γένος ἔχον ἕδραν τρίτην καὶ μέσην, τῆς ἑρμηνείας αἴτιον, εὐχαῖς τιμᾶν μάλα χρέων χάριν τῆς εὐφήμου διαπορίας. *Epinom. pag.* 1010.

(*o*) Τὸ δαιμονίων ἐστὶν— ἑρμηνεῦον καὶ διαπορθμεῦον Θεοῖς τὰ παρ' ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ Θεῶν, τῶν μὲν τὰς δεήσεις, καὶ θυσίας, τῶν δὲ τὰς ἐπιτάξεις καὶ ἀμοιβὰς τῶν θυσίων. *Symposium p.* 1194.

(*p*) ——προσευκτέον ἵν' ἐυμενεῖς ὦσι. *Celsus apud Origen. lib.* 8. *p.* 394.

† *Cuncta cœlestium voluntate, numine, & autoritate fiunt, sed Dæmonum obsequio, opera, & ministerio.* Apuleius de Dæmonio Socrat. p. 45.

Ministers and Messengers. Hence do they rank them in the *second* and *third* place from God, and put this Office on them *quia nullus Deus miscetur homini*, because no God, that is, properly so called, doth immediately converse with man; this is so plain that *Austin* doth acknowledg that the difference betwixt †*Plato*'s *good Dæmons*, which he acknowledged *to be made by the highest God, and the good Angels was only in the name.* Having thus drawn the Paralel, we are prepared to attend *T. G*'s. pretences of a great disparity betwixt this Invocation of the Heathen Dæmons, which by the ancient Fathers was charged with Idolatry, and that Invocation of the *Saints* departed, which is now practised by the *Church* of *Rome*, which will be quickly done, since all his great disparities are only great impertinencies: for what is this unto the Doctors Argument concerning Invocation, that *they do not offer Sacrifice unto the Saints departed*; which is his fourth disparity: Or, *that the God they worship is the true immortal God, who sees the secrets of the hearts*, which is his first disparity. What is it to the purpose to say, *the persons they address their prayers unto are not Devils, or wicked wretches, but the blessed Spirits*; for if the same kind of Invocation be used to both, it must be deemed Idolatry in both; because in both it is the giving of the worship due to God unto the Creature; when this is done unto the best of Creatures, then is Idolatry committed; when this is not done, we may be guilty of Superstition or (δεισιδαιμονία) in giving of inferior worship, or *Dulia*, to the work of Creatures, but cannot be guilty of Idolatry: And this cuts of his third disparity.

† *Nos si Platonici malunt Deos, quam Dæmones dicere, eisque annumerare, quos a summo Deo conditos Deos scribit eorum autor & magister* Plato, *dicant quod volunt non enim cum eis de verborum controversia laborandum est.* — & rursus, *Quamvis nominis controversia videatur.* Aug. de Civ. Dei l. 9. cap. 23.

pag 351. 4. *Their Office is not to inform the supream God of* what

what he knows not, ſaith *T.G. but to be joynt Petitioners with us*: and what is this unto the purpoſe? ſeeing the Fathers neither did, or could condemn them of Idolatry for thinking God did not know our Prayers without Interpreters. But for what was conſequent upon it, *viz.* the making their addreſſes to them to preſent their requeſts to God, and by their prayers to obtain his bleſſings: the firſt opinion made them ſacrilegious in robbing God of what did properly belong unto him, and with this we do not charge the Papiſts in this caſe. The *ſecond* is Idolatrical in giving of his honor to a Creature, of which they are but too much guilty. This *T.G.* ſaw, as well as I: and therefore for the ſame good reaſon that ſome unskilful Painters write under their work *this is a Dog*, *a Cat*, &c. *T.G.* at the foot of his performance writeth thus, *I have ſpoken home to the Caſe*, and then he ſtates it thus, *whether the practiſe of Catholicks in honouring and invocating the Saints, be the ſame with that of the Heathens, in the worſhip of their inferior Deities?* "Thus expiring Candle gathers "up its Spirits, and forces it ſelf into a blaze "before it dies. Alaſs! that we ſhould all this "while have been miſtaken in the queſtion. The queſtion hitherto controverted betwixt Dr. *St.* and him, in this particular, was concerning *the Invocation of Saints*, as *T.G.* doth himſelf confeſs, *p.* 350. "but now like a miſchievous "Card that will ſpoil the hand, this is dropt un- "der the Table, and all the ſhow above board is, whether their Invocation of Saints doth differ, not from the Invocation, but the whole *worſhip of inferior Dæmons*. "The buſineſs of ſo- "lemn ſupplication to them is the Caſe in de- "bate between us and the Church of *Rome* (ſaith

Pag 352.

T.G. pag. 440.

Pag. 145. "Dr. *St.*) If ever you would ſpeak home to the "caſe do it upon this point. I beg your pardon, ſaith *T.G.* I am not free to ſpeak upon that point; I know my foot muſt ſlip if I ſhould touch upon it, and therefore though you preſs me, and call upon me to ſpeak home unto it, I am reſolved to be reſerved; nay, I am conſcious to my ſelf, that all that I have ſpoken is impertinent to that Caſe, I have not, nor I cannot ſhew the leaſt diſparity betwixt their Invocation of inferior Dæmons: and that Invocation of the Saints, vvhich *Roman Catholicks* do practiſe: but if inſtead of ſpeaking to this one caſe of ſupplication, you will let me wander, through the vvhole worſhip of thoſe Dæmons, then I have three diſparities to offer; this is the twig the poor man catcheth hold of, to ſave both him and his vvhole Church from ſinking, but in vain; for the diſparities which he hath repreſented betwixt that honour vvhich they give to Saints, and vvhat the Heathen do aſcribe to their inferior Dæmons is not only horribly impertinent, but alſo vain and frivolous, as vvill appear by reaſſuming of his heads of difference, as 1.

T.G. pag. 351. *The perſons to whom we addreſs our ſelves for their prayers, are not Devils or wicked Wretches, but the Friends and Servants of God.* *Anſw.* 1. St. *Auſtin* Dec. D. l. 9. c. 23. manifeſtly doth aſſert, That either all, or at the leaſt, the better ſort of *Platoniſts*, *Hoc ipſum dicunt quod dicimus*, did aſſert the ſame of their good Dæmons, which we do of the bleſſed Angels; that there was alſo no diſſention betwixt them and *Chriſtians* touching theſe bleſſed Spirits; and that the controverſie was but this, whether they ſhould be called *Dæmons*, as they were wont to ſtile them, or *Angels*, as the Chriſtians called them: and therefore it is manifeſt

nifeſt, he did not think the *Platoniſts* good Dæmons to be Devils, or wicked Wretches, as *T. G.* ſuggeſts. 2. It is apparent from their Writings, that other Heathens had the ſame apprehenſions of them, which the Papiſts have of *Saints* and *Angels*, for they diſtinguiſhed them into ſuch Spirits, as * *were by death delivered from the body*, and ſuch *as never were united to the body.* And hence that Law of the old *Romaniſts*, † *Let them be worſhipped who have always lived in Heaven, and thoſe whoſe merits have advanced them to that place*; where we have both the ſame objects of our worſhip, and the ſame reaſon of that worſhip given, *viz.* their merits, or as *Triſmegiſtus* hath it, *the vertues of their life.* And though I grant they were miſtaken in their apprehenſions, yet he that doth ſo confidently aſſert, That *Roman Catholicks would not be guilty of Idolatry, provided the material object of their worſhip ſhould be bread, becauſe they apprehend what is bread not to be there, but Chriſt*; cannot have any reaſon to quarrel with the *Heathens*, becauſe, when they performed their worſhip to an Image in whom theſe Spirits were conceived to be preſent, they apprehended no evil Spirit to be there, but only pure and holy Souls, and bleſſed Dæmons.

* *Verum hæc omnis diſtributio eorum Dæmonum fuit, qui quondam in corpore humano fuere. Sunt autem non poſteriore numero præſtantiori longe dignitate ſuperius aliud angu-ſtiuſq; genus Dæmonum, qui ſemper à corporis compedibus & nexibus liberi.* Apuleius l. de Deo Socratis. p. 50.

† *Divos & eos, qui cœleſtes ſemper habiti, colunto: & illos quos in cœlum merita vocaverunt.* Cic. de legibus. l. 2.

2. *Their office*, ſaith he, *is not to inform the ſupreme God of what he knows, but to be joynt Petitioners with us. Anſw.* Admit all this, the *Fathers* do expreſly hold they ought not to be worſhipped upon that account. But 2. Let me crave leave of good St. *Auguſtine* to aſſert,

That

That the *Platonists* did not conceive that God was ignorant of what was done on Earth, or that he needed *Dæmons* or any other Spirits to inform him of our words, thoughts, or actions. St. *Augustine* (I confess) infers this Doctrine from what they did assert, but that they constantly professed and taught the contrary, is clearer than the Sun. * "*Petavius* tells us, "That the tenth Book of *Plato* is spent in proving that God wants neither power, will, "nor knowledge, to make his providence concerned about the least things which are done "on Earth, and that expresly he declares, "that the Gods discern, know, and hear all "things, and that nothing which our sense or "reason can perceive, can be concealed from "them. *This*, saith † *Plotinus* and *Ammonius*, *must be certain, that if the Gods are the first causes of all things, they cannot possibly be ignorant of any thing which is in any manner done by them.* Moreover the ‖ *Platonists* affirmed, That God had *this knowledge from and by himself, and from no other, and that nothing was required but his nature to make him understand all things.* Particularly, both *Platonists* and others held that God was the searcher of the heart, and was himself acquainted with the thoughts of men. Hence

* *Theolog. Dogm. Tom* 1. *l.* 8. *c.* 4.

† Πρῶτον μὲν Θεοὺς ἀμφότεροι φάτε γιγνώσκειν καὶ ὁρᾶν καὶ ἀκούειν πάντα, λαθεῖν δὲ αὐτοὺς οὐδὲν δυνατὸν εἶναι τῶν ὁπόσων εἰσὶν αἱ αἰσθήσεις τὲ καὶ ἐπιστῆμαι. *l.* 10. *de leg. p.* 955.

Ὅλως δὲ εἰ πᾶσα ἀνάγκη τῶν ὄντων ἁπάντων αἰτίους εἶναι τοὺς Θεοὺς, ἢ προσαιτίους πῶς ἂν ἔχοι λόγον, ἢ ἀγνοεῖν αὐτοὺς τὰ οἰκεῖα γενήματα, ἢ τὰ τῶν οἰκείων γενημάτων ἀποτελέσματα, ἢ τὰ ὑπ' ἐκείνων κεθ' οἷον δὲ ποτὲ τρόπον γινόμενα, *Ammonius Comment. ad librum Aristotelis de interpretatione.*

‖ —— Εἰ τὶ νοεῖ παρ' αὐτοῦ νοεῖ - εἰ δὲ παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ νοεῖ αὐτός ἐστιν ἃ νοεῖ. *Plotinus Enn.* 5. *l.* 9. *c.* 5 *Vid. Petavium T.* 1. *l.* 4. *c.* 2.

(*a*) *Thales*

(a) *Thales being asked, whether the actions of men could be concealed from God; he answers, No, nor yet our thoughts. Nothing is hid from God,* saith *Seneca, he is both present to our minds and thoughts,* Whence he exhorts us so to live as in his sight, and so to think, as having one who looks into our breasts. (b) *The Gods,* saith *Socrates, know all things which are spoken, done, and which in silence we consult.* (c) *God sees all minds,* saith *Antoninus, devested of those Barks and material Vessels that contain them, for with his mind alone he reacheth all those minds which are derived from him, and are lodged in them.* Whence he exhorts us so to be (d) affected in our minds, as that the Gods may see that nothing doth trouble or disgust us. (e) *This we are first to learn,* saith *Epictetus, that there is a God, whose Providence doth reach to all things, and that not only what we do but what we think cannot be hid from him. It is more agreeable to God,* saith *Plutarch, to perceive the actions of the soul than of the body; he therefore knows the dispositions of all men.* This is but little of that which might be easily produced to confirm this truth; but

(a) Ἐρωτώμενος εἰ λάθοι τις θεὸν ἀδικῶν ἢ τὰ ἐνθυμήματα, Οὐδ' ἂν τὰ ἔργα, ἔφη. Οὐδὲν λέληθε τὸν θεόν. Ἔστι γὰρ ἐν τοῖς νοήμασι καὶ ἐν τοῖς λογισμοῖς. Ἐκεῖθεν οὖν ὁρμώμενος παρακελεύεται οὕτω ζῆν ὡς ἂν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ βλεπόμενος καὶ οὕτω διανοεῖσθαι ὡς ἂν ἐνοικοῦντος ἐν ἡμῖν θεοῦ. *Senec. Ep.* 83.

(b) Πάντα θεοὺς εἰδέναι τὰ τε λεγόμενα, καὶ πραττόμενα καὶ τὰ σιγῇ βουλευόμενα. *Xenophon memorab. l.* 1.

(c) Ὁ θεὸς πάντα τὰ ἡγεμονικὰ, γυμνὰ τῶν ὑλικῶν ἀγγείων, καὶ φλοιὸν καὶ καθαρμάτων ὁρᾷ μόνῳ γὰρ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ νοερῷ μόνων ἅπτεται τῶν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ εἰς πάντα ἐρρυηκότων καὶ ἀπαχθεισμένων. *M. Antonini l.* 12. *Sect.* 2. Τὰ ἔσω γὰρ δεῖ τοιαῦτα ᾖ καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν θείων βλέπεσθαι ἄνθρωπον πρὸς μηδὲν ἀναγκαίως διατιθέμενον μηδὲ διεστραμμένα. *Id. l.* 11. *Sect.* 13.

(d) Μαθεῖν δεῖ πρῶτον τοῦτο ὅτι ὁ μὲν θεὸς καὶ προνοεῖ τῶν ὅλων· καὶ οὐκ ὀκνεῖ λαθεῖν αὐτὸν ἃ μόνον ποιοῦντα, ἀλλ' ἃ καὶ διανούμενον ἢ ἐνθυμούμενον. *Epict dissert l.* 2. *c.* 14.

(e) Ἀλλ' ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἀγνοεῖ ἢ πᾶν τὸ ἐκείνου διάθεσιν, ἄτε δὴ ψυχῆς μᾶλλον, ἢ σώματος αἰσθάνεσθαι πεφυκώς. *Plutarch. de tarditate divin. vindict.*

p. 24

Nihil Deo clausum est, interest animis nostris cogitationibus intervenit; Senec. Ep. 83.

but yet it is ſufficient to inform the Reader, that *T. G.* was ſcandalouſly ignorant if he did not know it, or ſcandalouſly wicked, if knowing this, he ventured to declare the contrary.

3. *We*, ſaith *T. G. do not procure or buy this favour of them by offering Sacrifice to them. Anſw.* True; but then you offer up your prayers unto them, which in the judgment of the ancient Fathers is the beſt and higheſt Sacrifice, as I have proved already, *Prop.* 4. *Corol.* 1. 2. As *Roman Catholicks* do pray to Saints departed, and do aſcribe unto them the knowledge of the heart, becauſe they vainly do conceive theſe things are not ſo proper to God, but that they may be attributed to the Creature; ſo Heathens offered their firſt fruits and Sacrifices to inferior Dæmons, becauſe they vainly did conceive they were not properly that worſhip which was due unto the higheſt God, but ſuch as might be given to thoſe *Dæmons*, which they acknowledged to be Creatures. This is apparent from what St. *Auſtin* doth aſſert concerning them, *viz.* "That they conceiv'd theſe vi-
De C. D. l. 10. *c.* 19. "ſible Sacrifices might agree to leſſer Gods, "but that to him who is inviſible, the greater "and the better God, inviſible, greater, and "better Sacrifices do agree, *viz.* the duties of "a pure mind, and a good will. I grant they were deceived in this apprehenſion: But if the *Romaniſts* cannot be juſtly charged with Idolatry, although the object of their worſhip ſhould be Bread, becauſe they do conceive it not to be ſo, why ſhould the Heathens be deemed guilty of Idolatry in this particular, although the act of worſhip which they confer upon the Creature, be proper to God, ſeeing they alſo do conceive it

it not to be ſo? For as Dr. *Taylor* argues in behalf of them; if theſe Heathens thought this act of worſhip proper to God, they who command us not to exceed in paying honour to them, would be far from doing of it; which is a demonſtration that their ſoul hath nothing in it that is Idololatrical.

Laſtly, The Doctor ſaith, *The wiſer Heathens acknowledged one God, not* Jupiter *of* Creet, *but the Father of Gods and Men.* To this *T. G.* replies, That *Origen ſaith that* Jupiter *was a Devil.* But if *Origen* ſpake this of *Jupiter* of *Creet*, or if he did not ſpeak it of the Philoſophers ſupreme God, which *T. G.* never offers to aſſert he did, what can be more impertinent? The Learned *Voſſius* had met with ſome as ignorant as *T. G.* who thought that the *Philoſophers* God was not the *true Jehovah*, and that the Heathens had not the knowledge of him; and thus he puts the Queſtion to them: "What will theſe perſons "ſay to Bleſſed *Paul*, who calleth *Jupiter* God? "What, doth he underſtand that *Jupiter* who "was ſo infamous for his Adulteries? Sure it "is no ſuch matter; he with the Philoſophers "did underſtand that infinite mind that runs "through all things; why elſe doth he approve "that ſaying of *Aratus*, *For we are all his off-*"*ſpring?* Why doth he manifeſtly apply that to "the true God which *Aratus* ſpake of *Jupiter*, "for he begun his Verſes with him. This "therefore is the mind of the Apoſtle, that we "are his off-ſpring, whom the *wiſer Heathens* "underſtood by *Jupiter*, which he would not "have ſaid, had not ſome of the Heathens had "the knowledge of the true *Jehovah*. When "St. *Paul* ſaith, *Him whom you ignorantly worſhip, I declare unto you*, how manifeſtly doth he af-

P. 145.

P. 350.

De Theol. Gent. l. 1. c. 2. p. 7.

Acts 17.

"firm,

"firm, that the *Athenians* worshipped that very "Deity of which he was about to speak, *viz.* "*God that made the world*, &c. And how can "any man deny this thing, saith he, when the Rom.1.20 "same Apostle doth affirm that they knew God, "and that he had manifested to them that which "may be known of God; for what is more ab- "surd than to imagine, that the true and only "God should manifest unto them any other "God besides himself?‖ *Petavius* could have in- "formed him, That it was the business of the "*Fathers*, in their *Apologies* and Exhortations "to the *Gentiles*, to shew, that both the wisest "and the most eminent *Poets* and *Philosophers* ac- "knowledged the one true God, and laughed "at those vain fictitious Deities the vulgar "worshipped. But 2. *The God whom we adore*, saith *T. G. is not that wise Father of Gods and Men, who was so high as not to know what was done here below, but the true and immortal God, who sees the secrets of our hearts, and knows our necessities before we utter them. Answ.* This also did the God of the *Philosopher*, as we have largely proved. * *Let God be what he will*, saith *Pliny, he must be all sense, all eye, all hearing.* † *He must be deemed*, saith *Hippocrates, to be immortal, and to hear, and see, and know all things, both present, and to come.* Of this we have innumerable evidences in *Lipsius Physiol. Stoic. l.*1. *Dissert.* 6. xi. *Petav. de Deo. To.* 1. *l.*4. *cap.* 1. 2,3,4. and *l.* 8. *c.*4. *sec.* 6. and *Gataker in Antoninum. l.* 1. *sec.*3. *l.*6. *sec.*13. *l.*12. *sec.*2.

Veteres cum adversus Deorum cultores Christianam causam agunt, insignium Poetarum, ac philosophorum, necnon Sibyllarum testimonia quamplurima referunt, quæ unicum Deum esse, Deos autem illos, quos vulgus ascivit, mentitos & inanes esse prædicant. Petav. T. 1. l.1.c.3. p. 17.

* *Quisquis est Deus, totus est sensus, totus visus, totus auditus, totus animæ, totus animi, totus sui.*

† Δοκεῖ δὲ μοὶ ὁ καλέομεν θερμὸν, ἀθανατόντε εἶναι, καὶ νοεῖν πάντα, καὶ ὁρᾶν, καὶ ἀκούειν, καὶ εἰδέναι πάντα τὰ ὄντα καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι. *Apud Lipsii Physiol. Stoicorum l.*1. *dissert.*6. *p.* 30.

To

To this convincing evidence of Dr. *St.* That invocation of the Saints deceaſed was not the Doctrine of the ancient Church: we add theſe four Conſiderations: 1. That *Lactantius* and others diſpute againſt the Heathens with ſuch Arguments as perfectly deſtroy this practice, and confute this Doctrine, and which could never, without the higheſt folly, be alledged by thoſe who did approve either the Doctrine or practice of the *Church* of *Rome*. * *Quid ſibi volunt ſimulacra, what mean their Images,* ſaith he, *which either are the Monuments of the Dead or abſent Perſons? for upon this account were theſe ſimilitudes invented, that the memory of them might be retained, who are either dead, or abſent from us: in which of theſe two orders will you place your Gods? If in the number of the dead men, is any man ſo fooliſh as to worſhip them? If in the number of the abſent, they are not to be worſhipped, if they can neither ſee what we do, nor hear our Prayers:* Where note, that it is here ſuppoſed, as an unqueſtionable thing, that perſons abſent can neither hear our Prayers, nor ſee our Actions. Let me then ask *T.G.* "what mean the Images of the Church "of *Rome*, which are either the monuments of "the dead, or abſent perſons; in what order "will you place your Saints and Angels? If in "the number of dead men; Why then are you "ſo fooliſh as to worſhip them; If in the num-"ber of the abſent, they are not to be wor-"ſhipped, ſince they can neither ſee our acti-"ons, nor hear our prayers. What I have thus retorted on the *Church* of *Rome*, if the like

* *Quid ſibi — volunt ſimulacra, quæ ipſa ſimulachra, quæ aut mortuorum aut abſentium monimenta ſunt? Deos igitur in quorum numero reponemus? Si in abſentium: colendi ergo non ſunt: ſi nec vident quæ facimus; nec audiunt quæ precamur. Si autem Dii abſentes eſſe non poſſunt; quoniam divini ſunt, in quacunque mundi parte fuerint, vident & audiunt univerſa: Supervacua ergo ſunt ſimulachra, illis ubique præſentibus; cum ſatis ſit audientum nomini precibus advocare.* Lactant. de Origine Erroris, l. 2. c. 2.

practice

practice had then obtained in the *Church* of *Christ*, might have been with like evidence returned upon *Lactantius*.

Tertullian tells the Heathens, that by allowing many Gods (*a*) *they do affront as many of them as they do not worship, for the prelation of any one, is a reproach to all the rest*: which Argument doth equally impugne the worship of the *Church* of *Rome*: For who knows not, that many of their Saints, who in some Countries are worshipped more than Christ himself, are scarcely known in others.

(*a*) *Cum alii alios Deos colitis, eos quos non colitis, utiq; contemnitis: prælatio alterius sine alterius contumelia esse non potest, nec ulla electio non reprobatione componitur. Qui de pluribus suscipit aliquem eum quem non suscipit despexit. Sed tot ac tanti ab omnibus coli non possunt! Jam ergo tunc primo contempsistis, non veriti scilicet ita instituere, ut omnes coli non possent.* Tertul. ad Nationes, L. 1. c. 10.

2. The Ancients prayed for all the Saints departed, excepting neither Apostles, Martyrs, or the blessed Virgin: The Liturgy of the Church of *Constantinople*, ascribed to St. *Chrysostome*, saith; (*b*) *We offer unto thee this reasonable Service, for those who are at rest in the faith, our Fore-fathers, Fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles, Preachers, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, Religious Persons, and every Spirit perfected in the Faith: But especially for our most holy, immaculate, most blessed Lady the Mother of God, and ever Virgin* Mary. —*Remember all them who are fallen asleep in the hope of the Resurrection to eternal life, give them to rest where the Light of thy Countenance presideth.* The *Liturgy* ascribed to St. *Mark*, having made mention of the *Patriarchs*, *Prophets*, and *Apostles*, &c. speaketh thus, (*c*) *Lord make the Souls of all these to rest in the Tabernacles of thy Saints, in thy Kingdom, conferring on them all the good things promised.* Which is a pregnant evidence

(*b*) Chrysost. Tom. 6. p. 998, 999.

(*c*) Bibliotheca Patrum Gr. Lat. Tom. 2. p. 35. A.

dence, that the first Authors of those Liturgies did not invoke the Blessed *Virgin*, or the *Evangelists*, *Apostles*, *Martyrs*, or any other Saints departed, this being a known Rule (and as (d) Pope *Innocent* declares *the voice of Scripture*) *that he who prayes for any Martyr doth offer an affront unto that Martyr.* Nay, even common sense and reason shews, that it is very foolish and absurd to pray for them, and to commend them to Gods favour, to whom we therefore pray, because, we think their merits and their interest with God is such as that they can prevail by vertue of them for all the blessings they can ask for others.

(d) *Cum sacræ Scripturæ dicat auctoritas, quod injuriam facit Martyri qui orat pro Martyre.* Innocent. III. P. R. Decret. l. 3. de celeb. Miss. tit. 41.

3. The *Heathens* did object against the *Christians*, that they put up Supplications to the Man *Christ Jesus*, whose birth and ignominious death they owned. (e) *Dost thou not know*, saith *Maximus* unto *Androniçus* the Martyr, *that him whom thou invokest was a man who suffered under* Pontius Pilate? And in *Arnobius*, the Heathen thus disputes, (f) *You Christians do adore with daily Supplications, and look upon him as a God, who was both born a man, and suffered an ignominious Death on the Cross.* And had the Christians of that time put up their Supplications to the *Apostles*, *Evangelists*, and *Martyrs*, and the *Blessed Virgin*, had not the Heathens greater reason to object, that they offered up their Supplications unto such as were but ordinary men, and who continued in the state of death?

(e) *Inique non scis quem invocas hominem quendam fatum, sub custodiâ* Pontii Pilati *punitum?* In Act. Andr. apud Bar. A.D. 290. §. 26.

When in the dayes of *Julian* this custome did insinuate it self into the Church of Christ, and

(f) *Sed non, inquit, idcirco Dii vobis infesti sunt, quod omnipotentem colatis Deum: sed quod hominem natum, & quod personis infame est vilibus, crucis supplicio interemptum, & Deum fuisse contenditis, & superesse adhuc creditis, & quotidianis supplicationibus adoratis.* Arnobii adversus Gentes l. 1. p. 20.

they began in *Panegyrical Orations* to speak unto the *Martyrs*, as to men present with them; *Eunapius* presently cryes out, Μάρτυρες γοῦν ἐκαλοῦντο καὶ διάκονοί τινες καὶ πρέσβεις τῶν αἰτήσεων παρὰ Θεῶν: *that they call their Martyrs Ministers, and Legats of their Prayers to God.* That therefore this was not objected by *Porphyry* or *Celsus*, or taken notice of, as their objection, by any of the ancient Fathers, is an assurance that they had no such practice in the purest Ages of the Church.

Eunap. in Ædesso. p.65.

4. This will be farther evident, if we consider, that in the writings of the *Apostles* and *Evangelists*, and of the ancient *Fathers*, we have no rules prescribed for the Canonizing of any Saints departed, or any mention of this custome till the seventh Century: for since it is so great a Crime to worship damned Spirits next to God, seeing to celebrate their praises, and to give God thanks for their Examples, and for the Graces of his Spirit, is so absurd a thing: And yet it is a thing, saith (g) *Bellarmine*, *that easily might happen from the neglect of this Canonization*; we may conclude that they who never took the care to practise it, did not allow that worship which made its observation necessary.

(g) *Nisi judicio Ecclesiæ certi Sancti proponerentur colendi, facile fieri posset, ut populus sæpe erraret, & damnatos pro Beatis coleret.* Bellarm. de Sanct. Beat. c. 7. §. Sed.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

The Contents.

General Heads of Answer to the Testimonies produced by T. G. *from Antient Fathers*, 1. *That the Fathers of that time did more unquestionably practise and approve what hath been since condemned by the Church of* Rome, V. G. *They practised the communicating of Infants, they approved the necessity of it to Salvation.* Sect. 1. *They approved the Doctrine, that the Righteous did not enjoy the sight of God before the Resurrection.* Sect. 3. *Secondly, That the Fathers cited by him, do many of them in words more clear, and writings more authentick, deny, or disapprove this practise.* Sect. 2. *Thirdly, Many of the Fathers of those times held Doctrines inconsistent with that practise,* Sect. 3. *viz. that Saints did not enjoy the Beatifick Vision,* ibid. *Secondly, That they did not hear or understand our words directed to them, and that it was doubtful whether they had the knowledge of our condition, yea, or not.* Sect. 4. *Fourthly, That the forementioned Fathers did often speak to their departed Friends as present, although*

they did not think them ſo to be. Sect. 5. *Fifthly, That the very ſame Authors do make the like addreſſes to inſenſate Creatures, which makes it reaſonable to look upon them as* Rhetorical *Apoſtrophe's.* ibid. *Sixthly, That there is great difference betwixt the practiſe which then began to be approved in ſome parts of the Chriſtian World, and the practiſe of the Church of* Rome, *as* V. G. 1. *That no inſtance can be given of any Chriſtian that put up mental Prayers unto them, or did aſcribe unto them the knowledge of the heart.* 2. *That they prayed unto them only upon ſuppoſition of their preſence at their Tombs, and Oratories.* Sect. 6. *The Authors cited by* T. G. *are partly ſpurious or doubtful.* Sect. 7. *Partly impertinent, and ſuch as uſe either Rhetorical Apoſtrophe's or only wiſhes.* Sect. 8. *or ſuch as only do aſcribe unto them the worſhip of honour and affection, but ſay not any thing which neceſſarily includeth Prayer.* Sect. 9. *Or only do aſſert that they did pray with us, and ſo did help us with their Prayers.* Sect. 10. *Or that they did commend themſelves unto their Prayers by deſiring God, that for their interceſſion he would be gracious.* Sect. 11.

§. 1. AND thus we have confirmed the truth of our aſſertion from the moſt pregnant Teſtimonies of the ancient *Fathers* of the *four firſt Centuries*: We come now to conſider

ſider what *T. G.* offers from the *Fathers*, to prove the invocation of the Saints departed, to have been the practice of the *Primitive Church*: Unto which purpoſe he alledgeth ſome paſſages of *Gregory Nazianzen*, and *Nyſſen*, St. *Cyril*, and St. *Ambroſe*, *Ruffinus*, St. *Baſil*, *Chryſoſtome*, St. *Auſtin*: to which we Anſwer,

1. That all theſe Fathers lived in the declining times of the fourth Century, or after the concluſion of it. *Baſ. M. A.* 370. *Nazian.* 379. *Niſſenus* 380. *Ambroſe* 374. *Chryſoſt. An.* 398. *Hierom. ob.* 420. *Ruffinus* 418. *Auguſt* 396. *Cyril Alex.* 412. *Theodoret* 423. Nor can one item of ſuch a practice be produced from any of the former Writers; ſo that if all theſe Fathers did expreſly ſay what *T. G.* doth contend they do, it would be only this, *That the moſt ancient Fathers of the three firſt Centuries, and to the middle of the fourth, were in this matter perfect Proteſtants, whereas ſome of the middle Fathers, who lived in the declining Ages of the Church, do ſeem to ſpeak in favour of the Church of* Rome: Now in this caſe we ſay with *Cyprian*, (a) *If verity doth warp or lean aſide, we muſt look back, and return to Divine, Evangelical, and Apoſtolick Tradition; and derive the order of our action, from the original ground where it firſt began.* And with *Tertullian*, (b) *If a cuſtome proceeding from ignorance or ſimplicity, be confirmed by uſe of ſucceſſion, and*

(a) *Si in aliquo mutaverit, & vacillaverit veritas, ad originem Dominicam, & Evangelicam, & Apoſtolicam traditionem revertamur, & inde ſurgat actus noſtri ratio, unde & ordo & origo ſurrexit.* Ep. 74. Sect. 14.

(b) *Oſtendam — hoc exigere veritatem cui nemo præſcribere poteſt non ſpatium temporum, non patrocinia perſonarum, non privilegium regionum, ex his enim ferè conſuetudo ab aliqua ignorantia vel ſimplicitate initium ſortita in uſum per ſucceſſionem corroboratur, & ita adverſus veritatem vindicatur, ſed Dominus noſter Chriſtus veritatem ſe, non conſuetudinem cognominavit, ſiquidem ſemper Chriſtus, & prior omnibus, æque veritas ſempiterna, & antiqua res.* De Veland. Virg. c. 1.

opposed against verity, we must observe that neither space of time, nor priviledge of persons may prescribe against truth; for Christ is eternal, and before all, and in like sort, verity is most ancient: For who knoweth not, that above 100 years before this time, the practice of communicating Infants had obtained in the Church: St.* *Cyprian* makes mention of it twice; the † *Apostolick Constitutions* declare, that first the Priests communicated, then Virgins, after them, Widows, and then τὰ παιδία, or their little Infants. In the same Century (c) *Theodorus* Bishop of *Mopsuestia* in *Sicily*, concludes against his Adversaries, that *Infants must be acknowledged to be guilty of sin, because, it was the custome to administer Christs Body to them for the Remission of Sin.* They also held, that it was necessary to eternal life for Infants to receive this Sacrament. *When Christ saith, If you eat not my flesh, you shall not have life in you; should I say that an Infant should have life, who ends his life without that Sacrament:* So *Austin.* Again, (d) *Let us hear our Lord*, saith he, *speaking of the Sacrament of the holy Table, whether none rightly comes, but he that is baptized:* and then citing this place; *Unless you eat my flesh*, &c. he adds, *Dare any say that this sentence belongs not to Children, but that they may without the participation of the body and blood of Christ, have life in themselves?* For this he also urgeth the Testimony of the *See of Rome*; (for then this Doctrine, as

*De Lapsis Sect 7. & 20.

† l. 8. c. 13.

(c) Καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἅγιον Βάπτισμα, καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀγράντου σώματος κοινωνίαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτίων καὶ τοῖς βρέφεσι ἐπιφερόμενα, &c. *Apud Phot. in Bibl.* 177

(d) *Dominum audiamus, inquam, non quidam hoc de Sacramento lavacri dicentem, sed de Sacramento Sanctæ mensæ suæ, quo nemo ritè, nisi Baptizatus, accedit, nisi manducaveritis carnem meam & biberitis sanguinem meum non habebitis vitam in vobis——an verò quisquam etiam hoc dicere audebit quod ad parvulos hæc sententia non pertineat, possintque sine participatione corporis hujus & sanguinis in se habere vitam?* Tom. 7. l. 1. de peccat. meritis & remiss. c. 20.

well as Practice, was received there.) (e) *Behold*, saith he, *Pope Innocent of bleſſed memory, declares that little ones cannot have life without Baptiſm, and the participation of the Body and Blood of Chriſt*: And in his Epiſtle to *Paulinus*, if the *Pelagians*, ſaith he, *will yield to the Apoſtles Seat, or rather to their Lord and Maſter, ſaying, that except we eat his fleſh, and drink his blood (which the unbaptized cannot do) we ſhall not have life, they will at laſt confeſs that unbaptized Infants cannot have it.* The Words of *Innocentius* are theſe; (f) *Whereas your Brotherhood aſſerts, that the Pelagians ſay that Infants may be ſaved without Baptiſm; this is a very fond opinion, for unleſs they eat the fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, they have no life in them.* (g) *Whence it is evident* (ſaith *Binius*) *that this was Pope Innocents opinion, which alſo was maintained in the Church* 600 *years*, viz. *that the participation of the Euchariſt was neceſſary to Infants*: and what he thus confeſſeth is made good by * *Dalle* from the *fourth* incluſive, to the *eleventh Century*, by the plain pregnant Teſtimonies of them that lived in thoſe Times; Who alſo doth abundantly confute that vain imagination of Mr. *Creſſy* and *Vaſquezius*, that they conceived it neceſſary that Infants ſhould partake Chriſts Body and his Blood not *Sacramentally*, but *Spiritually*, by ſuch a participation

(e) *Ecce B. memoriæ Innocentius Papa fine Baptiſmo Chriſti, & ſine participatione Corporis & Sanguinis Chriſti, vitam non habere parvulos dicit.* To. 7. contra duas Ep. Pelag. l. 2. c. 4. p. 190. L. *Si autem cedunt* (Pelagiani) *Apoſtolicæ ſedi, vel potiùs ipſi Magiſtro, & Domino Apoſtolorum qui dicit non habituros vitam in ſe ipſis, niſi manducaverint carnem filii hominis, &c. (quod niſi Baptizati non utique poſſunt) nempe aliquando fatebuntur parvulos non Baptizatos vitam habere non poſſe.* Epiſt. ad Paulinum, Ep. 106. p. 101.

(f) *Hæc enim ejus verba ſunt, Illud verò quod eos veſtra fraternitas aſſerit prædicare parvulos æternæ vitæ præmiis etiam ſine Baptiſmate Gratia poſſe donari perfatuum eſt, niſi enim manducaverint carnem filii hominis.* Auguſt. contr. duas Epiſt. Pelag. l. 2. c. 4.

(g) *Hinc conſtat Innocentii primi ſententia (quæ 600 circiter annos in Eccleſia viguit, quamque Auguſtinus ſectatus eſt) Euchariſtiam etiam Infantibus neceſſarium fuiſſe.* Concil. Tom. 1. part. 4. p. 624.

as may be had in Baptism. Lastly, they also do affirm this Doctrine to be derived from (*h*) *Apostolical Tradition*, and *deeply setled in the Churches of Christ*, as doth most evidently appear from that of *Austin*: *From an ancient, and (as I suppose) Apostolical Tradition, the Churches of Christ have this deeply setled in them, that without Baptism and the participation of the Lords Supper, no man can attain to the Kingdom of God, nor yet to life eternal: If therefore so many Testimonies Divine convince us, that everlasting Life is not to be expected without Baptism and the Body and Blood of Christ, 'tis in vain to promise it to children without them.* And yet the *Church of Rome* hath laid aside this practise, and determined against this Doctrine thus: (*i*) *Si quis dixerit Parvulis antequam ad annos discretionis pervenerint necessariam esse Eucharistiæ communionem anathema sit*: Which must be thus interpreted; "If any Person now doth say, what the whole Church of Christ did for 600 years together; *viz.* That it is necessary for Infants "to be partakers of the Eucharist, let him be "accursed. I will not quarrel with them, as Mr. *Dalle* doth for their *intolerable irreverence to the ancient Fathers*, nor for the Curse they have pronounced on the whole Church of Christ, for many Ages; but I will take the Boldness to infer, that if they may condemn a practice far more ancient than was the Invocation of departed Saints, a practice not opposed, as that

(*h*) *Optimè Funici Christiani Baptismum ipsum nihil aliud quam* salutem, *& Sacramentum Corporis Christi, nihil aliud quam* viam *vocant, unde nisi ex Antiqua, ut existimo, et Apostolica traditione; qua Ecclesiæ Christi institum tenent præter Baptismum & participationem dominicæ mensæ, non solum ad regnum Dei, sed nec ad salutem, & vitam æternam posse quenquam hominum pervenire, hoc enim & scriptura testatur (viz.* Tit. 3. 5. 1 Petr. 3. 21. John 6. 51, 53.) *si ergo, ut tot & tanta Divina testimonia concinunt, nec salus, nec vita æterna, sine Baptismo & Corpore & Sanguine Domini cuiquam speranda est, frustra sine his promittitur parvulis.* Tom. 7. lib. 1. de peccat. meritis, &c. c. 24. p. 144 D. E.

(*i*) Concil. Trid. Sess. 21. Can. 4.

was, by many Fathers of the Church, upon its first encroachment, when about *A. D.* 360. it began to creep into the Church, a practice so deeply setled in all Christian Churches in St. *Austins* time, when that of Invocation of Saints departed, was but in the *Embryo*; Lastly, a practice proved from clear, unanimous, and numerous assertions of the learned Fathers; (Whereas what is produced for the other practice is obscure and contradictory to what in other places they deliver, and fairly may admit another sense, as you shall see hereafter;) I say, if they may wholly lay aside this practice, and may pronounce Anathema's against it: I hope we also may refuse to practice this Invocation of the Saints departed, provided that it were as ancient as the Times of *Nazianzen*, *Basil*, and St. *Austin*.

2 Observe, "That though these Fathers § 2.
"cited by *T. G.* seem in some places to assert
"or use this invocation of the Saints departed,
"in others they deny the Doctrine, and disap-
"prove the practice of it; and this they do in
"Writings more assuredly Authentick, and in
"words more clear and pregnant, than are,
"or can be brought to justifie it. This I might easily make good, by an induction of the places cited *pro* and *con*, from all these *Father*; but since *T. G.* hath singled out St. *Austin*, as a p. 431. man so clear and pregnant in this Point, that whosoever shall deny St. *Austin*, to have held such formal invocation to be the Worship due to Saints, must *shut his eyes, and fight against the light of a noon-day truth*: Let any man peruse the places which are cited from that Father, and say, whether I have not reason to affirm this bold Assertion to be a manifest untruth.

The

The paſſages produced out of the genuine Works of *Auſtin* for Invocation, are,

1. *Let Bleſſed* Cyprian *help us with his prayers.* T. G. p. 430.

2. *We Chriſtian People do with religious ſolemnity celebrate the memory of Martyrs, both to excite us unto the imitation of them, and that we may become partakers of their merits, and may be helped by their prayers.* T. G. p. 433.

3. *It is an injury to pray for a Martyr, to whoſe prayers we ought to be commended.* T. G. p. 434.

Againſt it we produce theſe Teſtimonies.

* (1.) *Chriſt is the Prieſt, who being now entred within the Vail, only of all that have been made partakers of fleſh, makes interceſſion for us there.*

† (2.) *If he* (i. e.) *St.* John, *had ſaid thus, If any man ſin, you have me a Mediator with the Father, I make interceſſion for your ſins,* (*as* Parmenian *in one place doth make the Biſhop a Mediator betwixt the People and God*) *what good and faithful Chriſtian would endure him, who would look upon him as the Apoſtle of Chriſt, and not as Antichriſt?*

‖ (3.) *Thou haſt not whither thou canſt go but to me, nor haſt thou any other way to go but by me.*

* *Ipſe Sacerdos eſt, qui nunc ingreſſus in interiora Veli, ſolus ibi ex his qui carnem geſtaverunt interpellat pro nobis. In Pſalm.* 64. p 144. *M.*

† *Si vero ita diceret, hoc ſcripſi vobis ut non peccetis, & ſi quis peccaverit, Mediatorem me habetis apud Patrem, ego exoro pro peccatis veſtris, ſicut* Parmenianus *quodam loco Mediatorem poſuit Epiſcopum inter Populum & Deum, quis eum ferret honorum atque fidelium Chriſtianorum? quis ſicut Apoſtolum Chriſti, & non ſicut Antichriſtum intueretur.* Contr. Epiſtol. Parmen. l. 2. c. 8. p. 7. L. Tom. ſeptimo.

‖ *Non eſt quo eas niſi ad me, non eſt quâ eas niſi per me.* Tract. 22. in Joh.

§. 3. Thirdly, Obſerve, that many of theſe Fathers held thoſe Doctrines and opinions which are inconſiſtent with this practice, according to the Judgment of the *Romaniſt*. As 1. It is the

the Judgment of the Doctors of the Church of *Rome*, (*a*) *That our petitions ſhould be directed only to ſuch Saints as do enjoy the beatifick viſion*, or a clear ſight of God, and are admitted into thoſe glorious Manſions which are emphatically ſtiled Heaven. And this they do imagine to be neceſſary upon three accounts: 1. That they may give a reaſon why this practice was never uſed by the (*b*) *Prophets*, or the *Jewiſh Church*, and why it is not ſaid in Scripture, or in the Jewiſh Records, *Sancte Abraham, Ora pro me*, Holy *Abraham*, Pray for me. And 2. Why neither they, nor any other perſons, did ever put up a petition to the (*c*) *Saints in Purgatory*. 3. Becauſe this (*d*) *beatifick viſion* is conceived to be that glaſs, in which the bleſſed do behold the prayers that are made unto them, or at the leaſt it is required as a preparatory to this Revelation. Now *Thomas Stapleton* informs us, That (*e*) *many famous ancient Fathers*, Tertulli-

(*a*) *Illi qui ſunt in Purgatorio, nondum fruuntur viſione verbi, ut poſſint cognoſcere ea quæ nos cogitamus vel dicimus, & ideo eorum ſuffragia non imploramus orando.* Aquin. 2a 2æ.qu.83. Art.4.

(*b*) *Notandum eſt quia ante Chriſti adventum ſancti qui moriebantur non intrabant in cœlum, nec Deum videbant, nec cognoſcere poterant ordinariè preces ſupplicantium, ideo non fuiſſe conſuetum in Teſtamento veteri ut diceretur* ſancte Abraham, Ora pro me. Bellar. de Sanctorum Beatitud. l. 1. cap. 19. S. item Exodi.

(*c*) *Dicendum eſt ideo non fuiſſe morem in veteri Teſtamento adeundi Sanctos Interceſſores, quia nondum erant beati & glorificati ut modo ſunt.* Alphonſ. Salmer. in 1 Tim. 2. diſp. 8.

(*d*) *Quod autem aliquis directè oraverit Sanctos defunctos ut ſe adjuvarent, vel pro ſe orarent nuſquam legimus, hic enim modus orandi eſt proprius legis Gratiæ, in quo Sancti videntes Deum poſſunt etiam in eo videre orationes quæ ad ipſos funduntur.* Fr. Suarez. in part. 3. Th. To. 2. diſp. 42. Sect. 1. V. Albert. Pigh. Controv. 13.

(*e*) *Tot illi & tam celebres antiqui Patres*, Tertullianus, Irenæus, Origenes, Chryſoſtomus, Theodoretus, Oecumenius, Theophylactus, Ambroſius. Clemens Romanus, D. Bernardus, *hanc ſententiæ (quæ nunc in Concilio* Florentino *magnâ demum conquiſitione factâ ut dogma fidei definita eſt) quod juſtorum animæ ante diem Judicii Dei viſione fruuntur non ſant aſſenſi. ſed ſententiam contrariam tradiderunt.* Defenſ. Eccleſ. Authorit. contr. Whitak. l. 1. cap. 2.

an,

an, Irenæus, Origen, Chryſoſtom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Ambroſe, Clemens Romanus, *and* Bernard. *did not aſſent unto this ſentence, That the Souls of the righteous enjoy the ſight of God before the day of Judgment; but did deliver the contrary ſentence thereunto.* To theſe *Franciſcus Pegna* adds, *Juſtin Martyr, Auſtin, Lactantius, Victorinus, Prudentius, Aretas,* and *Euthymius.* The truth of which Confeſſions of theſe *Roman* Doctors, you may ſee largely prov'd in † *Dalle*: And that this Doctrine was almoſt generally received, about that time when all thoſe Fathers flouriſhed which *T. G.* citeth, to confirm the invocation of Saints, is evident from that of * *Auſtin*, *Nondum ibi eris: quis neſcit?* Thou ſhalt not as yet be there: who knoweth it not?

In part. 2. direct. Inquiſitor. comment. 2 1.

† De pœnis & ſatisfact. l. 5 c. 3, 4, 5, 6.

* *Poſt vitam iſtam parvum nondum eris, ubi erunt Sancti quibus dicetur, Venite benedicti Patris, percipite regnum quod vobis paratum eſt ab initio mundi. Nondum ibi eris, quis neſcit? Sed jam poteris ibi eſſe, ubi illum quondam ulceroſum pauperem, dives ille ſuperbus & ſterilis in mediis ſuis tormentis vidit à longè quieſcentem.* Tom. 8 in Pſal. 36. fol. 61. G. H.

2. It is confeſſed by many Doctors of the Church of *Rome*, that if the Saints deceaſed do not hear and underſtand our Prayers, it is a vain and idle thing to pray unto them: *if this*, ſaith (*a*) *Lorca*, *was not ſuppoſed by the Church of Chriſt, ſhe would firſt pray unto God to reveal our Prayers, and then would put up her Petitions to them*: Now almoſt all the Fathers cited by *T. G.* held that the *Dead did neither know nor were acquainted with our Petitions or our wants, or at the leaſt, they were of* (*b*) Origens *Opinion, that it was doubtful whether they did or no.* Thus *Ambroſe* ſpeaking of his dead brother, ſaith *didſt thou now know*

(*a*) De Beatitud. diſp. 25.

(*b*) *Si etiam extra corpus poſiti, vel ſancti qui cum Chriſto ſunt, agunt aliquid & laborant pro nobis ad ſimilitudinem Angelorum, qui ſalutis noſtræ miniſteria procurant, —habeatur hoc quoque inter oeculta Dei, nec chartulæ committenda myſteria.* Orig. in Rom. l. 2. p. 472.

how

how * Italy *was pressed with so near an Enemy, how wouldst thou groan within thy self?* St. *Hierom* in *Nepotians Epitaph* professeth he believs him (d) *mingled amongst the Quire of Saints:* And yet he adds, *whatsoever I shall say will be but speaking to the Deaf, because, he hears not:* and again, *happy is Nepotian, who neither hears nor sees these things:* (e) *The Spirits of dead men are there where whatsoever things are done or happen in this life to men, they do not see them.* So St. *Augustine*; and therefore *Anselm* in his *interlineal Gloss* upon that Text, *Abraham is ignorant of us*, noteth thus, *Austin saith that the dead do not know what the living do.* Else where he is less positive, and only saith, (f) *whether at all, or how far, or after what manner the Spirits of the dead could know the things that are done here, is a great question.* And the like doubt we find in *Nazianzen* in his *Rhetorical Apostrophe's*: for in his invective against *Julian* he speaks thus; (g) *Hear O thou soul of great* Constantius (*if thou hast any understanding of these things*) *and as many souls of the Kings before him as loved Christ.* Where the *Greek Scholiast* upon that *Parenthesis* putteth this Note; σοκρατικὸν, ἀντὶ τῶν ἐάν τις αἴσθησις ἐστὶ τῶν τῇ δὲ ἀκούειν *He speaketh according to the manner of* Isocrates, *meaning, if thou hast any power to hear the things that are here.* And therein he saith rightly, for *Isocrates* useth the same form of speech, both in his *Evagoras*, and in his *Ægineticus*; Ἔι τις ἐστὶν αἴσθησις τοῖς τελευτηκόσι, περὶ τῶν ἐνθάδε. *If they which be dead have sense of the things which are done here.* The

* *Si nunc urgeri* Italiam *tam propinquo boste cognosceres, quantum ingemisceres.* Ambros. de obitu fr. Satyri.

(d) *Quicquid dixero quia ille non audit mutum videtur.* f. 8. B. *Scimus quidem* Nepotianum *nostrum esse cum Christo & Sanctorum mixtum choris.* ib. 1. *Felix* Nepotianus *qui hæc non videt, felix qui hæc non audit.* p. 10. B.

(e) *Ibi ergo sunt Spiritus defunctorum ubi non vident quæcunque aguntur, aut eveniunt in istâ vitâ hominibus. De cura pro mortuis.* c. 13.

(f) *Respondeo magnam quidem esse quæstionem, vtrum, vel quatenus, vel quomodo ea quæ circa nos aguntur noverint Spiritus mortuorum.* August. in Psal 108. Enar. 1. p. 276. A.

(g) Ἄκουε καὶ ἡ τοῦ μεγάλου κωνσταντίου ψυχὴ εἴ τις αἴσθησις ὅσαι τε πρὸ αὐτοῦ βασιλέων φιλόχριστοι: στηλιτ. α. p. 2. *Ed. Eton.*

like

like limitation is used by the same *Nazianzen* toward the end of the funeral Oration, which he made upon his Sister *Gorgonia* where he speaketh thus unto her; (*h*) "If thou hast any "care of the things done by us, and holy souls "receive this honour from God, that they have "any feeling of such things as these; receive "this Oration of ours, instead of many, and be-"fore many funeral obsequies. Whence it is evident, that the Foundation of this Doctrine was doubted by them; And then it follows, that the thing it self was in those times only a doubtful, or a disputable point, and therefore that it was not delivered to them by tradition, or confirmed by Scripture, and cannot be required as the Condition of Communion without Schisme: 2. Hence we have just reason to suspect that in those other passages, we meet with of like Nature, these words, *If thou hast any sense, or apprehension of these things*, when they are not expressed, may very well be understood: and that this is the genuine import of their Rhetorical Petitions.

§.4. Observe that the afore-mentioned *Fathers* did often speak to their deceased Friends in such a manner, as if they did suppose them present, although they did not think them so to be: thus* *Nazianzen*, when ready to conclude his Funeral Oration upon his Father, speaketh thus, *What saist thou Father, is this sufficient?* And † *Austin* speaks to *Chrysostom*, who had been dead some years before; *Enter*, *St.* John, *enter, and sit together with thy brethren.* And ‖ *Chrysostom* to *David* thus, *What is it thou desirest*, David, *thy sins are pardoned, what wouldst thou more? Oh* David, *go, give God thanks, and ever glorifie him.* And again, *why art thou troubled, David, let me*

(*h*) Εἰ δὲ τις σοὶ καὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐστὶ λόγος, καὶ τοῦτο ταῖς ὁσίαις ψυχαῖς ἐκ Θεοῦ γέρας τῶν τοιούτων ἐπαισθάνεσθαι, δέχοιο καὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον λόγον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, καὶ πρὸ πολλῶν ἐνταφίων. *Greg. Nazian. Orat.* 2. *in Gorgon.*

* Tom. 1. p.314. B.

† l.1. contra Julian. c. 6.

‖ Tom. 1. in Psal. 50. p.703. l.27.

me know. This * *Nazianzen* doth acknowledge to be the meaning of his addresses to *Constantius* when he believed he did enjoy the vision of God: for thus he speaks, "What was the matter, oh divinest King, and greatest lover of "our Lord, for I am moved to find fault, as "if thou wast here present, and didst hear me, "though I do know thee to be now with God, "and in possession of his Glory. And this way of speaking they borrowed from the *Heathen Orators* and *Poets*, whom we find speaking thus; "O *M. Drusius* I appeal to thee; O "† *Amphiarius*, who art now buried in the "Earth, heareſt thou this? || What shall we "say *Cleanthes*, is this a wicked thing.

* Τί ποτε τὸ νόημα τῶν εἰς Κωνσταντίνον ὦ διοτρεφὲς ὅτε ἐνόμιζε τὸν Θεὸν ἐφορᾶν, ἀκούων ἐμοῦ τὰ τοιαῦτα; Φέρε γὰρ ἐρῶ τὸν λόγον, ὦ φιλοχρίστου φιλοκυρίου κεφαλή· ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἐπιτιμᾶν ἔοικα, ὡς παρόντος σου καὶ ἀκούοντος· ἀλλ' ὅμως οἶδα καὶ νῦν σὲ μετὰ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ δόξῃ. Καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ἐκ τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησι ῥητόρων καὶ ποιητῶν ἐμιμήσαντο, οὓς ἔστιν εὑρεῖν καὶ πολὺ τοιαῦτα λέγοντας· Ὦ Μᾶρκε Δρούσιε, σὲ ἐπικαλοῦμαι· ὦ Ἀμφιάριε, ὃς νῦν ὑπὸ γῆς εἶ, ταῦτα ἀκούεις; Τί δὲ ἐροῦμεν, ὦ Κλεάνθη; μῶν ἄτοπον τοῦτο; *Nazianz. Orat. Decima. quarta. p.* 214.

† Ὦ πάσχα τὸ μέγα καὶ ἱερὸν, καὶ πάντων τῶν κόσμου καθάρσιον· ὡς σὲ ἐμφύσω σοι διαλέξομαι· *Nazianz. εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πάσχα Or.* 42. *p.* 696.

|| *Quid dicemus* Cleanthe? *num in illa re — mali nihil fuisse.* Tusc. Quæst. l. 3. p. 163. Ed. Paris. 1555.

"speak.

Στηλλ. p. 1. "speak. Hear you who live at preſent, and "hereafter ſhall be born. St. *Ambroſe* ſpeaks unto the Water thus; 'Oh Water which haſt "obtained to be the Sacrament of Chriſt, which "waſheſt all things, and art not waſhed thy ſelf, "thou doſt begin the firſt, and doſt compleat "the perfect Myſteries. In the like manner we find * *Euſebius* calling upon *Piety*, and † *Optatus* upon *Water*: and this they did agreeably to the Example of the || *Orator*, who doth implore, and doth beſeech *the broken Altars of the Albans*; and puts up his Petition to their Tombs and Groves: and to the frequent cuſtome of the ſacred Writers, who cry out, * *Hear O Heaven, and perceive oh Earth! Hear ye, O Mountains, the Lords controverſie, and ye ſtrong Foundations of the Earth.* † *Praiſe the Lord from the Earth, ye Dragons and all Deeps.* || *Fire, and hail, ſnow and vapor, ſtormy wind, fulfilling his word. Mountains and all Hills, fruitful Trees and all Cedars.* Which form of Compellation is ſtill retained in our *Liturgy*. And yet I hope *T. G.* will not infer that the Jews of old did, and Engliſh Proteſtants do at preſent properly invoke and intercede to thoſe inſenſate Creatures. Laſtly, we find in *Lipoman* one ſpeaking to the girdle of the Bleſſed Virgin in this manner; "O venerable girdle, "make us Heirs of eternal and bleſſed Life, and "preſerve us in this our preſent life, from per-"dition: O undefiled Girdle, preſerve thy "people from pollution. If this and ſuch like ſpeeches of the *Church* of *Rome* muſt be acknowledged to be figurative, why may we not aſſert the ſame of ſuch Expreſſions of the Fathers as are uſed to thoſe Saints departed, of whom they do aſſert that what is ſpoken to them, becauſe they do not hear it, is as if it had been ſpoken to inſenſate Creatures.

6. Ob-

* *Ambroſ. l. 10. in Luc. c. 22.*

*De Vit. *Conſtantin* l. 5

† Optat. l. 6. p. 98.

|| *Vos vos Albani inmuli atque luci, vos inquam implora atque obteſtor, voſque Albanorum obrutæ aræ, &c.* Orat. pro Milone, p. 558. Ed. Pariſ.

* Iſa. 1. 2.

† Micah. 6. 2.

||Pſal. 148. 7, 8, 9.

Sect. 6.

6. Obſerve, there is great difference betwixt the practice that in theſe times began to be approved by ſome men, and what is now the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*. For,

1. That which we chiefly do object againſt that Church, is, that ſhe doth enjoyn us to believe, *That even mental prayers are well addreſſed to them, and conſequently that they have the knowledge of the conceptions of the heart, and the ſincerity of its intentions.* Whereas the Fathers of that age, without diſtinction or exception, held that it was proper to God to perceive the ſecrets of the heart; this, by the concurrent judgment of the Fathers, being no more communicated to the Creatures, than was the Knowledge of what was future and contingent, as I have proved already *chap* 6. *Prop.* 2. 4.

2. Whereas the Doctrine and practice of the *Roman* Church, doth make it good and profitable *for all people, to call upon them in all places, though as far diſtant from them as is Earth from Heaven, or as one corner of the Earth is from the other*; ſome of theſe Fathers did conceive the Saints were preſent at their Tombs and Shrines, and being ſo, they might attend unto the prayers of them that did reſort unto them. Thus when it was objected by *Vigilantius* to St. *Jerom*, *If it be ſo, then the ſouls of Martyrs love their aſhes, and hover ſtill about them, and are always there, leſt if any Petitioner ſhould come, they being abſent, ſhould not hear him*; I ſay, when this was urged by *Vigilantius*, agreeably to that opinion which then began to gather ſtrength, and to be owned in the *Chriſtian Church*: St. *Jerom* doth not, as *T. G.* deny the ſequel, but lays down this abſurd and monſtrous Tenet to defend it, *That* * *if the Lamb be every where, they alſo that be with the*

* *Si agnus ubique, ergo & hi qui cum agno ſunt ubique eſſe credendi ſunt.*

† *And with the Lamb, must be believed to be every where.* Moreover, he represents it as a wicked speech of *Vigilantius*, † *That the souls of the Apostles and Martyrs could not be present at their Tombs*, never suggesting in the least that such a presence was needless to this end. *St. *Austin* doth affirm, "That either the Martyrs themselves must be at "one time in such divers places, so far distant "from one another, (*viz.* as they were distant with whom they were conceived to pray at their memorials) "or if they were not pre- "sent, they must be removed from all com- "merce with the affairs of men here, and only "prayed in general for the necessities of suppli- "cants. *Sulpitius* upon the death of St. *Martin* comforts himself with this consideration, ‖ *That he would not be wanting to them*; and of this assertion he immediately subjoyns this reason, *viz. he will be present with us speaking of him, and will stand by us when we pray*; upon which passage the Scholiast observes, that *it was vulgarly believed, that holy Martyrs were present at their Sepulchers*. That this was also the Opinion of *Nazianzen*, *Basil*, and all the Fathers cited by *T. G.* is largely proved by †*Bochartus*. If then these Fathers did in this particular maintain what is confessedly erroneous, why might they not be subject to the same mistake, touching the doctrine of invocation of the Saints departed, and then that error in their judgment must necessarily give rise to that unwarrantable practise, which in those times began to be approved.

Having in general laid down these propositions, I might decline all farther Answer to what *T. G.* produceth from the testimonies of the forementioned Fathers, in favour of that practise we dispute against; but, that he may not think

vel in sinu Abrahæ, vel in loco refrigerii, vel subter aram Dei animas Apostolorum & Martyrum consedisse, nec posse de suis tumulis, & ubi voluerunt, adesse præsentes. Hier. adversus Vigilant.

* De cura pro mortuis c. 16.

‖ *Non decerit nobis ille, mihi credo, non decerit, intererit de se sermocinantibus, adstabit orantibus.* Epist. 2. de obitu & appar. S. Martini p. 533. ed. Lugd. Batav.

† Traitté second de l'invoc. des Saints c. 4.

we ſtudy to decline what he hath offered, we proceed to a particular reflection on them; and ſhall endeavour to demonſtrate that they are either cited out of ſpurious and doubtful books, or are impertinently alledged. And, Sect. 7.

1. Amongſt the ſpurious, or doubtful Authors, we reckon that paſſage cited from St. *Chryſoſtom*; this was the Judgment of *Eraſmus*, who in his preface before his Latin Tranſlation of *Baſil de Spiritu ſancto*, ſaith, that *there are ſomethings in that book which muſt own him for their Parent, who mixed his weak and wordy trifles with the ſweet works of* Athanaſius *on the ſame ſubject, and who, in this Epiſtle, and in the Acts of the Apoſtles, endeavoured to be eſteemed* Chryſoſtom. And therefore when *Eraſmus* came to the 7*th. Homily* of this Epiſtle, he would tranſlate no farther: 2. this paſſage in ſome editions is not extant though theſe editions have proceeded from the hands of *Romaniſts*. 3 *Peter Du Moulin* makes evident the falſhood of this paſſage and the words preceding, not only from the diverſity of the ſtile, and want of a connexion with the precedent words, but chiefly from the doctrine, ſo full of ignorance & abſurdity, as ſhews it to be inconſiſtent with the Judgment and Learning of that *Holy Father*. Laſtly this place is cited by *Gareſius* under the name of *Theodorus Daphnopatus*, who therefore is moſt like to be the Father of this ſpurious paſſage.

Hom. 26. in 2 Cor.

Novelty of Popery. p. 422, p. 423.

De Sanct. invoc. p. 96.

Secondly, amongſt ſpurious and doubtful writings, We may reckon the Oration upon *Cyprian* faſly aſcribed to *Gregory Nazianzen*, where *S. Juſtina* is brought in τὴν παρθένον Μαρίαμ ἱκετεύουσα βοηθῆσαι παρθένῳ κινδυνευούσῃ (*i e*) *Entreating that the Virgin Mary would defend her againſt Cyprian*, who being then a *Pagan* endeavoured by Ma-

gical inchantments to attempt her chastity, but finding his attempts all frustrate, was by that means converted to the Christian Faith, and was that famous Bishop of *Carthage*, whose memory was precious through the Christian World. Whereas (1.) It is certain, St. *Cyprian* was never Pag. 1. in his life a Sorcerer, for *Pontius* his Deacon, who hath writ his life assures us, that *whilst he was a Heathen he was addicted to good arts, and such as tended to the benefit of the World*, which sure no Christian would affirm of a **Magician*. (2.) Whereas this fable ascribeth his conversion to *Justina*, or the experience of his vain attempts upon her; This *Pontius* wholly omits that Fable, and doth assure us, that he was converted by * *Cecilius* a *Carthaginian Presbyter*: (3.) † *Baronius* himself confesseth this story of the *Magick* of St. *Cyprian* to be *explodendam fabulam*: now hence it follows that this *Oration* is not the genuine work of *Nazianzen*, or else that *Nazianzen* was a man of very easie Faith, one prone to tell the most absurd and foolish fables for truth, and therefore one who can deserve no credit in this relation of *Justina*'s prayer unto the *blessed Virgin*.

* *Erat sane illi et. am de nebis contubernium viri justi & laudabilis Memoriæ Cecilii, & ætate tunc, & honore Presbyteri, qui eum ad agnitionem veræ divinitatis a sæculari errore correxerat.* P. 2.

† *Explosâ fabula illa de Cypriani Magicâ arte.* Baronius A. D. 250. Sect. 5.

Such thirdly is the passage cited from *Theodoret*, for, as ‖ *Vossius* well argues, "had that Book "been his; *Nicephorus*, who gives us the Catalo"gue of his books, would have made mention of "it. And *Photius* when he makes mention of the "writings of this *Author* which he had perused, would not have left out this. Besides, what is here cited from him, directly contradicts what he delivers in his undoubted Comment on the second and third Chapters of the Epistle of St. *Paul* to the *Colossians*. Lastly, the same we have just reason to suspect of the two instances related by St. *Austin De Civit. Dei l.* 22. *c.* 2. for *Ludovicus Vi-*

‖ Disp. Hist. de Invoc. Sanct. Th. 8. p. 198.

vis

ver doth ingenuously declare, *In hoc capite non dubium quin multa sint addita*, that many things have, without doubt, been added to this Chapter. The 33. *Homily de diversis* is one of those, which have been lately added to St. *Austins* Works, by the Divines of *Lovain*, and so deserves but little credit.

2. Those places which are cited from the true writings of the Fathers, are made to speak what they did not intend, and press'd to testify what they do not assert. Thus when *T.G.* objects that passage of St. *Austin*, *let B. Cyprian help us with his Prayers.* I answer, "May *T.G.* repent "of his accursed Apostacy from the Church of "*England.* This I entirely wish, and yet, I hope I pray not to *T.G.* but saith *T.G.* whoever con- "siders the motive alledged by him why he "addressed himself to St. *Cyprian*, which was for "that in Heaven, he saw more clearly the truth "of that Question, of which himself had for- "merly doubted, and *St. *Austin* was then treat- "ing of, and the necessity he had of his pray- "ers, as being yet in the mortal Flesh, and la- "bouring as in a dark cloud, will easily see that "it was not a counterfeit, but a true and seri- "ous address to him for the assistance of his "prayers. *Answ.* and why not rather an address to God for his assistance, by virtue of the prayers of *Cyprian*. 2. Had *Austin* said, let *Cyprian* help us, that we may be enlightened or instructed in this question, this Answer might have had some shew of strength, but when he only *wishes to be assisted by his prayers, *that he might imitate his goodness*, certain it is that not St. *Cyprians*

Sect. 8.

**Et* B. Cyprianus quidem jam corpore quod corrumpitur non aggravante animam nec deprimente terrena inhabitatione sensum multa cogitantem, serenius perspicit veritatem quam meruit adipisci per Christum; ad nos itaque nos orationibus suis *in istius carnis mortalitate, tanquam in caliginosa nube laborantes, ut donante Domino quantum possumus bona ejus imitemur.* To. 7. de Bapt. l. 7. c. 1. B.

Knowledg, but his charity, and his enjoyment of God, of which that Knowledg was a consequent, was the true motive of St. *Austins* wish, since he desires not to be instructed in the truth, but to be confirmed in Goodness; it was not the want of Knowledge but of Goodness, which he desired might be advantaged by the Prayers of *Cyprian*. Moreover, had he desired to receive these things from *Cyprian*, either by converse with him, or by some secret influence upon his clouded understanding, the circumstances mentioned might be conceived a proper motive to that wish; but since he only wishes to receive them *donante Domino*, or *from the Gift of God*, and by the Intercession of St. *Cyprian*, certain it is that the consideration of St. *Cyprians* Knowledg could be no motive unto that address, but only the consideration of his enjoyment of God, and his power with him, and of his charity by which he had obtained that enjoyment. To that of *Jerom*, * *Farewell, O Paula, help the old Age of thine honourer with thy prayers*; We have sufficiently replied by shewing, that it was frequent with the Fathers by an *Apostrophe* to speak to their deceased Friends, as if they did suppose them present, although they did not think them so to be: and this must necessarily be the sense of *Jerom*: For he declareth that his dear friend *Nepotian*, *being once joyned to the Quire of Saints, whatever he should say unto him would be but speaking to the deaf because he would not hear it*: he therefore must conceive the same of *Paula*, of whom he here affirms that *she was present with Christ*.

* *Vale O Paula, & Cultoris tui extremam senectutem oratione-bus juva, fides & cupera tua te Christo consociant, præsens facilius quod postulas, impetrabis.* Epitaph. Paulæ.

§. 8. The better to reply unto some other passages objected by *T. G.* observe first, *that the antient Fathers did yield a threefold Service to the Saints departed*, as first, *the honour of love and Society*. Se-

cond-

condly, *The Recognition and praises of their excellencies*. Thirdly, *The Imitation of their vertues, and their godly Examples*: this service the writers of the fourth and fifth Century, sometimes call worship, and Veneration, but the more ancient Fathers styled it *honour*, accounting all religious worship to be due to God alone, as is most excellently proved by *Dalle*. And when the *Hereticks* and Heathens did object against these latter *Fathers* the worship of the holy Martyrs, they reply two things. Advers. Lat. Cult. l. 1. c. 5, 1.

1. That they did not worship them as Gods. Thus when it was objected by the Apostate *Julian*, that * *instead of many Gods the Christians worshipped many miserable men*; St. *Cyril* answers, † *We do not make them Gods, nor do we worship that which by nature is not God*. And when *Faustus* had objected against the Christians, that they had ‖ changed their *Martyrs* into the *Heathen Idols*, and in like manner paid their Homage to them; St. *Austin* answers, that * *they gave not divine worship to them*.

* Ἔνα γὰρ ἀντὶ πολλῶν Θεῶν ἐσέβεσθε ἄν, οὐκ ἄνθρωπον, μᾶλλον δὲ πολλοὺς ἀνθρώπους δυστυχεῖς· *apud Cyril. l. 6 contr. Jul. p. 203.*

† Ἡμεῖς δὲ ὦ κράτιστε οὐκ ὡς σὺ νομόμηκας τεθεοποιήκαμεν ἄνθρωπον. *ibid.*

‖ *Vertistis Idola in martyres quos votis, inquit, similibus colitis.* Apud August. contra Faustum Man. lib. 20. chap. 21.

* *At illo cultu, quæ Latria dicitur, nec colimus, nec colendum docemus, nisi unum Deum.* August. ibid.

2. That Reverence and honour, which they oppose to this *Latria*, or divine worship, and which they acknowledg to be due, and given by them to *Saints* departed, they comprize in the forementioned particulars, or in such other matters as are, and do include no formal prayers, and no elicite actions of Religion; whence we may rationally conceive that neither Prayers

ers, nor Vows, nor any actions, which were properly religious, were then tendred to them, and that they did not think them parts of that *Dulia* which was due to Saints, but rather parts of that *Latria*, which was due to God alone. This is apparent from St. *Auſtin*'s Anſwer unto *Fauſtus*, *viz.* "the worſhip therefore, which we give the "*Martyrs*, is that worſhip of Society and Love "which we afford unto thoſe holy men whom "in this life we worſhip, but with that worſhip "which is called *Latria*, we worſhip God alone. Where (1.) obſerve that he aſcribes unto the *Martyrs* only that worſhip which in this life we give unto our *fellow Saints*. Now is it any part of that affection or ſociety we bear unto the living, to put up our petitions to them, when at great diſtance from us and inviſible? (2.) Unto this worſhip of Society and love (which doth not comprehend addreſſes made by way of Prayer to perſons abſent and inviſible) St. *Auſtin* doth oppoſe *Latria*, the worſhip proper to God: Whence we infer that worſhip which could not be included in theſe expreſſions of Society and Love, *viz.* all mental prayers, and ſupplications made by Speech to perſons at great diſtance and inviſible, muſt in St. *Auſtins* judgment be *Latria*, or the worſhip proper unto God alone. The like we may obſerve in *Cyril*, for having ſaid, *We neither do affirm the Martyrs to be Gods nor do we worſhip them with Latria, but with the worſhip of honour and affection*, He gives three inſtances of their honour: † *We give them all Veneration, we honour their Sepulchers, and we remember*

Contra Fauſtum lib. 20. c. 21.

† Αἰδῶς ἀπάσης ἀξίων τιμᾶσθαι, οὐ πιστεύομεν θεοὺς οὐδὲ σεβόμεθα τοὺς νεκροὺς, οὐ λατρευτικῶς δηλονότι, ἀλλὰ τῇ τῆς τιμῆς καὶ φιλοστοργίας σεβάσμῳ τρόπῳ τὰς ταφὰς αὐτῶν ἐπιτελοῦντες καὶ μνήμας ποιούμενοι.

καθάπερ ἐν τάξει γερῶν καὶ ἀγαπητίας τὴν ἀμέλειαν αὐτοῖς καταπενθέμενοι μνήμην *Cyril adv. Jul. l. 6. p.* 204.

their resplendent Vertues. Moreover the honour given to them seems therefore to be called σχετικὴ or relative, Because as *Basil* notes, *the honor given to the best of our fellow Servants is the sign and demonstration of our good will and respect towards our common Lord.* Whence that of St. *Gregory Nyssen* speaking to the *Martyr Theodorus*, *We hold this assembly for thee, to adore our common Lord, and make full commemorations of thy Victories.* So then these Answers and Objections which *T. G.* reckons a confirmation of this practice of invocation of the Saints departed, are rather a just prejudice against it, it being never mentioned by them upon these occasions, as any portion of that honour they bestowed upon these blessed Spirits, nor yet contained in what they mention.

Orat. de Theod. Martyre.

Secondly, Observe it was the custom of those times to put up their Petitions at the Martyrs Tombs, and this they did for these considerations, *viz.* (1.) From a presumption, that when the Christians came unto these Tombs, the blessed Martyrs joyned their Supplications with them, and by so doing helped to speed them, Whence *Basil* in his Oration on the 40 Martyrs, saith, *Together with these Martyrs let us pour forth our Prayers, for here are 40 sending up one Prayer, and if where two or three be gathered together, God is present, who doubts his presence where forty are?* (2.) That their Devotions might be enlivened, and their affections raised by the place. Thus *Austin* tells us, that * *What was offered to God was offered at the memories of the Martyrs, that by the admonition or remembrance which the very places give us, a stronger affection may arise to inflame our charity both toward those whom we imitate, and him by whose assistance we may be enabled to do it.*

§. 10.

* *Quod offertur, offertur Deo, qui Martyres coronavit, apud memoriam eorum quos coronavit: ut ex ipsorum locorum admonitione major affectus exurgat, ad acuendam Charitatem & in illos quos imitari possumus, & in illum quo adjuvante possumus.*

Contra Faustum Man. l. 20. c. 21.

Another

§. 11. Another custome of these Ancients was to † pray unto God, *that for the intercession of those Saints and Martyrs, he would grant them their requests*, just as the *Israelites* did desire kindness for the sake of *Abraham* and *David*. And this, saith *Austin*, haply may be conceiv'd that || *they in general making addresses unto God (as we do for the Dead, although we know not where they are, or what they do) for all the wants of such as come to these assemblies, God may be moved by their Prayers to grant what he sees needful for them*; as haply he is moved by the fervent Prayers of some Relations distant from us, to vouchsafe us blessings, and by the addresses of some Churches, to grant deliverance from Persecution unto others.

This observation is a sufficient Answer to many of those passages which *T. G.* cites to prove it was the custome of the ancient Church to invocate the Saints departed; as *V. G. Ruffinus* doth relate of *Theodosius*, * That *he went to all the places of Prayer, and lying prostrate before the Martyrs and Apostles Tombs, he asked succors by intercession of the Saints* (which upon supposition that they prayed with him, and did continually intercede for all that put up their petitions there, or for the whole Church militant, he might well do) but then it is not intimated that he beg'd these succors by invocation of the Saints. We also hope for benefit and succour from the intercessions of our pious friends, and of the whole Church militant, and may entreat God to help us for the sake of their petitions, yet is not this a warrant to put up supplications to

† Δεόμεθά σε πάντες ἡμεῖς, καὶ ταύτην προσφέρομέν σοι θυσίαν, ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν καὶ τῶν προκεκοιμημένων πρῶτον πατριαρχῶν, προφητῶν, Ἀποστόλων, Μαρτύρων ὅπως ὁ Θεὸς εὐχαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ πρεσβείαις προσδέξηται ἡμῶν τὴν δέησιν. Cyril. Catech. Mystag 5. p. 241.

Ideo ad ipsam mensam, non sic eos commemoramus quemadmodum alios qui in pace requiescunt, ut etiam pro iis oremus, sed magis ut ipsi pro nobis orent. August. Tract. 84. in Joh.

|| De cura pro Mortuis, cap. 16.

* Hist. Eccles. l. 2. c. 33.

our

our pious Relatives, or to the universal Church.

St. *Basil* in his Oration on the forty Martyrs saith, * *He that is pressed with affliction flyeth to them, and he that is glad runneth to them; the one that he may be freed from his affliction, the other that he may continue in that joyful state.* But then to *fly*, and *run unto them*, is only to fly and run unto the Tombs and Churches where they were interred, as is apparent from the following words; *Here it is that a woman praying for her Son is heard*: And from the Exhortation following; *Wherefore together with these Martyrs let us pour forth our Prayers*: Here therefore is a demonstration, that this blessed Chorus were judged †co-helpers of our Prayers by interceding with us (as are our fellow Christians here on earth, 2 *Cor.* 1. 11. *Rom.* 15. 30.) but here is not one tittle to demonstrate that they did, or that we ought to pray to them.

4. When *Austin* saith that *Christian People do with religious solemnity celebrate the memory of Martyrs, both to excite them to the Imitation of them, and that they may become partakers of their merits* (or Good works) *and may be helped by their Prayers*: This passage only proves that *Austin* held, what was then commonly asserted, that when the Christians came to Church, the blessed Martyrs joyned their Supplications with them, and by so doing helped to speed them: But it is no evidence that either Christians prayed unto the Martyrs, or that the solemnity was stiled Religious upon that account: For Protestants do bring their Children to the Church to be baptized,

* Ὁ θλιβόμενος τρέχει πρὸς αὐτούς, ἵνα λύσῃ τὴν θλῖψιν· ὁ δὲ χαίρων, ἵνα μείνῃ ἐν τῇ εὐφροσύνῃ. Ἐνταῦθα γὰρ ἐστιν ἰδεῖν γυναῖκα ὑπὲρ τοῦ υἱοῦ εὐχομένην καὶ εἰσακουσθεῖσαν. Διὰ τοῦτο μετὰ τῶν μαρτύρων τούτων τὰς εὐχὰς ἐκχέωμεν. Ἐνταῦθα τοίνυν ἐπίδειξις γέγονε τοῦ καὶ τοὺς χορεύοντας τούτους συλλειτουργοὺς εἶναι τῶν ἡμετέρων εὐχῶν, καὶ συμπαρακαλοῦντας ἡμῖν· καθάπερ καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ γῆς ἡμῶν ἀδελφοί· οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' οὐδὲ κεραία μία ἐνταῦθα ἐστὶν ἰδεῖν, ἐν ᾗ δείκνυται ὅτι καὶ ἐκεῖνοι ἐποίησαν, ἢ ὅτι δεῖ καὶ ἡμᾶς ταῦτα ποιεῖν. *Basil. Hom.* 20. *in* XL. *Mart.* p. 459.

† Συμπαρακαλοῦντες τῇ δεήσει. συναγωνίζοντες ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς.

tized, not only that they may be excited by that rite to the performance of the Christian Covenant, but that they may obtain advantage by the Churches Prayers, but yet they do not pray unto the Church. And *T. G.* may perhaps expect advantage from the Prayers of *Christs Church Militant*, and yet I hope he is not so expres for Invocation of the members of it, as for the invocation of the *Church Triumphant*. Besides, *Austin* himself expounds how we are helped by their Prayers: *viz.* because that God may be induced by their intercessions made in general for all that pray, to grant what he sees needful for them.

De cura pro Mort. c. 16.

Moreover, that this passage is no evidence that Christians held Religious Solemnities to the Martyrs, or did religiously worship Martyrs, is extreamly evident: For *Protestants* do also celebrate the memories of their deceased Friends with a Religious Solemnity performed in those places where they were interred, and yet they give unto them no Religious Worship: It therefore may be stiled a Religious Solemnity because of the Devotion paid to God, and not unto the Martyrs: But *this Exposition*, saith *T. G. is opposite both to the words themselves, and is refuted by St.* Austin, *for he declares himself not to speak of that Religious Worship which is due only to God, but such a kind of Worship with which even holy men in this life are worshipped; we worship therefore*, saith he, *the Martyrs with the Worship of love and society*: thus *T. G.* And yet in the same page he adds, *It is evident that St.* Austin *speaks of such Religious honour as is due to God himself*: If then within the space of ten lines St. *Austin* speaks both of Religious Worship, and of that Worship which is not in the strictest sense Religious, I hope the Dr. may be allowed to Answer with

p. 432.

with *T. G.* that when St. *Auſtin* ſaith, *We worſhip Martyrs with the worſhip of love*, he did not ſpeak of Religious Worſhip, though in this ſentence he expreſly doth ſo. For doth not St. *Auſtin* ſay, That *to ſpeak* † *properly, Religion ſignifies that Worſhip which is due to God alone*: Doth not he thus adviſe all Chriſtians, || *Let not the worſhip of the Dead be any part of your Religion, for if they have lived well, they will not ſeek theſe honours.* Doth not he ſay, * *They ſhould be honored with our imitation, but not be worſhipped with Religion?* and is not this ſufficient reaſon to conceave, that when he ſaith we honour the memory of Martyrs with religious Solemnity, the Religion of that Solemnity belongs to God, and not unto the Dead? Secondly, St. *Auſtin* ſaith † *We Chriſtian People do celebrate the memory of Martyrs with Religious Solemnity —— but albeit we erect Altars in memory of the Martyrs, we do not do it to them, but to the God of Martyrs.* If then *conſtituere Altaria in memorias Martyrum*, be to erect Altars to God in memory of the Martyrs, to celebrate Religious Solemnities in memory of the Martyrs, ought in all reaſon to admit of a like ſenſe, *viz.* we celebrate Religious Solemnities to God, in memory of Holy Martyrs.

† *Ipſa Religio quamvis diſtinctius non quemlibet ſed Dei cultum ſignificare videatur*, &c. de C. D. l. 10. c. 1

|| *Non ſit nobis Religio cultus hominum mortuorum, quia ſi pie vixerunt, non ſic habentur ut tales quærant honores, ſed illum à nobis coli volunt, quo illuminante lætantur meriti ſui nos eſſe conſortes.*

* *Honorandi ergo ſunt propter imitationem* Non adorandi *propter* Religionem. Auguſt. de vera Rel. Tom. 1. cap. 55. pag. 166. B.

† *Populus autem Chriſtianus memorias Martyrum religioſa ſolennitate concelebrat, & ad excitandam imitationem, & ut meritis eorum conſocietur atque orationibus adjuvetur; ita tamen ut nulli Martyrum, ſed ipſi Deo Martyrum quamvis in memorias Martyrum conſtituamus* Altaria. l. 20. contr. Fauſtum Manich. c. 21.

Whereas S. *Auſtin* ſaith, *It is an injury to pray to Martyrs, unto whoſe Prayers we ought to be commended*; This alſo may refer to the forementioned preſumptions;

presumptions; *viz.* That we ought to commend our selves to their Prayers, by going to the places where the Martyrs pray together with us, or by entreating God to hear us by vertue of their intercession, as doth the Church of *Rome*. Elsewhere he teacheth, that we commend our Friends unto their Prayers by burying of them where the Martyrs lye interred; so that we see this commendation of our selves and others to the Martyrs Prayers, doth not imply the Invocation of those Blessed Spirits.

The same St. *Austin* in his Book *de Cura pro mortuis*, speaking of such as did forecast to bury their departed friends, about the memories of the Saints, passeth his judgment of that action thus, * *When the survivors seek such comforts, wherein their well disposed mind towards their friends may be conspicuous, I see not what advantage these things may be unto the dead, except that whilst they cast about where the bodies of them that are dear to them should (or may) be laid, they may commend them so received, to the Saints as to Patrons, to be helped by their prayers to God.* Which passage only doth import, that by depositing their bodies by the Martyrs shrines, they engage the Martyrs to pray to God for them. And to the like effect is that which follows, *viz.* † *That when the mind doth cast about where the body of a dear friend may be buried, and straight a place occurreth to his mind, renowned for the name of some Martyr, the affection of him who thus remembreth and prayeth, forthwith commends the beloved soul to the same Mar-*

* *Cum talia vivorum solatia requiruntur, quibus eorum pius in suos animus apparet, non video quæ sunt adjumenta mortuorum, nisi ad hoc ut dum recolunt ubi sint posita eorum quos diligunt corpora in ipsam sanctis illos tanquam patronis susceptos apud dominum adjuvandos orando commendent.* Cap. 4. f. 214. E.

† *Cum itaque recolit animus ubi sepultum sit chari ssimi corpus, & locus nomine occurrit Martyris venerabilis, eidem Martyri dilectam commendat recordantis & precantis affectus.* Ibid. F.

tyr,

tyr, viz. that affection which induced the surviving perſon to think of placing his beloved friend by the memorial of that Martyr, and made him chooſe that as the place where he would commend the ſoul of his beloved friend to God. For that the prayer was directed to God, though put up at the Martyrs Tomb, is evident from the following words, ‖ *It may very much concern any, where he ſhould place the body of his deceaſed, who prayeth for his Spirit unto God, becauſe both the preceding affection hath choſen an holy place, and the body being placed there, the remembrance of that holy place renews and augments the affection.* That this is the true import of the place, and that the benefit St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of, was to be expected not from any prayers put up unto the Saints, but partly from the deſire of burying the deceaſed by the Martyrs ſhrine, upon preſumption of ſome advantage he might receive by being there interred, and partly from the increaſe of the affection of him that prayeth in that place to God, is admirably evident from that which follows, *viz.* * *When therefore a believing Mother deſireth that the body of her Son may be buried in the Martyrs Temple, as believing that his ſoul may be advantaged by the merits of the Martyr, this very thing that ſhe believeth thus, is a kind of prayer, and if any thing profiteth it is this.* Since therefore nothing elſe doth, in St. *Auſtin*'s judgment, profit, certain it is he doth not ſpeak of prayer directed to the Martyrs, for if ſo, he could not have confeſſed, that the *fore-mentioned faith did only profit*, much

‖ *Plurimum interfit ubi ponat corpus mortui ſui, qui pro Spiritu ejus Deo (N.B) ſupplicat, quia & precedens affectus locum elegit ſanctum & illic corpore poſito recordatus locus ſanctus eum qui præceſſerat renovat & auget affectum.* Cap. 5. H.

* *Cum ergo fidelis mater fidelis filii defuncti corpus deſideravit in Baſilicam Martyris poni, ſiquidem credidit ejus animam meritis Martyris adjuvari, hoc quod ita credidit ſupplicatio quædam fuit, & hæc profuit ſiquid profuit, & quod ad idem ſepulcrorum recurrit animo, & filium precibus magis magiſque commendat, adjuvat defuncti Spiritum, non mortui corporis locus, ſed ex loci memoria, vivus martyris affectus.* Ibid G.

leſs

less could he affirm it *to be that supplication* (to the Martyr) *which alone did profit.*

Lastly, It is confessed, that *Basil*, *Nazianzen*, and *Nyssen*, do in their *Panegyrical Orations* seem to invocate the Holy Martyrs. But then it is apparent, 1. That they doubted, whether these Martyrs had any sense or apprehension of the Requests put up unto them, and therefore prefaced their addresses with an εἰ τις αἴσθησις, *If you have any sense.* 2. They do ingeniously confess, that though they knew them to be absent, yet they were moved to speak unto them as if they had been present, and could hear them. 3. They make the like addresses to insensate Creatures, of whom they were assured that they could not hear them, which makes it reasonable to interpret their Addresses, rather as Wishes and Rhetorical Apostrophes, than direct Invocations and Petitions tendred to them; especially if we consider, that all those Fathers when they discourse of Prayer, define it to be a Colloquy with God, and therefore did not think that those addresses made unto the blessed Martyrs, had the true nature of a Prayer. Moreover, it is certain that they never offer'd any mental Prayer to Saint or Angel. And 2. That they conceived the Martyrs present in those places where they offer'd these devotions, and therefore were not guilty of those Doctrines and unwarrantable practices, for which especially we do condemn the *Roman* Church.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

The CONTENTS.

The Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome, *touching the Invocation of the Blessed Angels, delivered from their own Catechism and Rituals.* Sect. 1. *The Question stated.* Sect. 2. *The Idolatry of this Practice proved.* 1. *This practice doth ascribe unto them by way of Worship, what is proper to God:* viz. *The Knowledge of the Secrets of the Heart.* Sect. 3. 2. *Because, it is the Worship of the Mind.* Sect. 4. 3. *From the silence of the Old Testament.* Sect. 5. *An objection answered:* Sect. 6. *The Reasons of this silence which are alleged by the Romanist, Refuted.* Sect. 7. *And from the silence of the New Testament.* Sect. 8. 4. *From the Consideration of those principles whereby the Romanists condemn* White Magick, *as a practice guilty of Idolatry.* Sect. 9.

§ 1. THE Catechism of the Church of *Rome*, Published by the Decree of the *Trent Council*, gives us the Doctrine of that Church, touch-

ing the Invocation of the Holy Angels in these words; * *concerning this Invocation we have the Testimonies of the Scripture extant; For Jacob requested of the Angel with whom he wrestled that he would bless him, and he compels him so to do, for he professeth that he would not let him go without his Blessing; nor doth he only put up his Petition unto the Angel whom he saw, but also unto him whom he saw not, when he thus said, the Angel who delivered me from all evil bless the Lads.* Agreeable unto this Doctrine, is the continual practice of that Church in her Authentick *Lyturgies*: For to St *Michael* they pray thus.

* Extant divinæ scripturæ testimonia hujus invocationis. Jacob enim ab Angelo quicum luctatus fuerat petit ut sibi benedicat immo cogit, se enim non dimissurum illum profitetur nisi benedictione accepta, neque solum sibi ab eo tribui quem intuebatur, sed ab eo etiam quem minimè videbat tum cum dixit Angelus qui eruit me de cunctis malis benedicat pueris istis. Catechis. Rom. Part 3. cap. 2. Sec. 10.

* Sancte Michael Archangele defende nos in prælio ut non pereamus in tremendo judicio. Miss. festo Appar. Sancti Mich. Maii. 8.

* " Defend us in our Warfare we thee pray,
" Least we should perish in the dreadful day.

In the *Roman Ritual*, a Dying person is taught to pray *with his Heart*, when he cannot do it with his Mouth thus; * *All ye Holy Angels intercede for me, and succour me. To the Guardian Angel they pray thus;*

* Hortetur præterea ut eo modo quo potest, saltem, ex Corde, ita per intervalla precetur. Maria Mater Gratiæ, Mater Misericordiæ tu nos ab hoste protege, & hora mortis suscipe.

Omnes Sancti Angeli & omnes Sancti intercedite pro me, & mihi succurrite. Rituale Ed. Antuerp 1617.

" Thou

* "Thou watchful Guardian hither therefore fly,
"And from that Country where thy charge does lie,
"Divert what ere may prove their Minds Diſeaſe,
"And what diſturbs the peoples quiet peace.

* Huc cuſtos igitur pervigil advola
Avertens patria de tibi creditâ
Tam morbos animi quam requieſcere,
Quicquid non ſinit incolas, Brev. R. Reform. Off. Angeli Cuſt.

And again, * *Thou art my Hope; moſt glorious Angel, the moſt High hath given and appointed thee to be my Refuge, Let then no Evil come unto me, Let not the Scourge come nigh my Tabernacle. Mark me and gather me unto Gods glorious Servants; take hold of Shield and Buckler, and ſtand up to help me, ſay unto my Soul, I am thy Salvation.* The *old Roman Miſſal* f. 52. had a Prayer to this Effect.

* Tu es ſpes mea Glorioſe Angele, altiſſimus te poſuit & mihi dediſſe refugium tuum. Non accedat igitur ad me malum, & flagellum non appropinquet tabernaculo meo. Mi cuſtos Glorioſe me conſigna, & ſervis Dei aggrega Glorioſis. Apprehende arma & ſcutum & exurge Angele in adjutorium mihi; de animæ meæ ſalus tua ego ſum. Miſſa in honorem proprii Angeli.

* "Let every Man on every day,
"To *Gabriel* and to *Mary* pray
"Theſe are the ſpring whence vertue flows apace,
"Heavens hope, life's ſweetneſs, and diffuſed grace.

* Omnis homo omni die
Gabrielis & Mariæ
Poſcat beneficia
Ex his manet fons virtutis
Dulcor vitæ ſpes ſalutis
Et diffuſa Gratia.

Whence we obſerve, that *according to the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of* Rome, *Angels when abſent and inviſible, ſhould be invocated: for this they daily practiſe, and endeavour to confirm from the Example, and by the words of* Jacob. § 1.

Intercedite pro me & mihi succurrite.

2. Observe *that we must pray unto them, not only to obtain deliverance and protection for us, by their Prayer; but to perform it by their power*; for what they do conceive to be the Office of those Angels, *viz.* to keep us, to avert those dangers that are imminent, and to remove a present evil, must they not think it proper to request? If God hath placed a Guardian Angel for their refuge, may they not ask him to do the office of a Guardian, as well as any other thing, and to preserve them in their wayes, *that so no Evil may befall them?* this, upon supposition, that they do always hear our Prayers, is very Rational.

When therefore *T. G.* doth insinuate, that p. 361. *they only do desire these Blessed Spirits to offer up our Prayers, or to pray for us, as we desire the Prayers of just Men upon Earth*, he doth insinuate a most apparent falshood: for besides that signal difference betwixt requesting of our Brother to pray for us; and their Petitions directed to the holy Angels, to preserve them from the assaults of Satan, and to * confer upon them the greatest Blessings we can ask. I say besides all this; 1. We never do by word of Mouth, request an absent Person, nor do put up any Mental Prayers to our surviving Brethren, both which are tendred to the Holy Angels, by the *Roman Catholicks*.

* Tu Glorioſe Angele qui ſtas ante Dominum preces meas offer Altiſſimo & veni tribue mihi deſideriorum meorum abundantiam. Miſſa in honorem proprii Angeli in Miſſali Rom. Ed. Antuerp. 1577.

3. It is apparent from what we we have discoursed, that it is in vain to put up these Petitions to the Blessed Angels, unless we do ascribe unto them the knowledge of the Hearts of those that supplicate, and unless we do suppose them either present with us, or able to help us, being

being absent, and that they do accept this service when we pay it to them, that so as they are deemed to be able, they may assuredly be willing to relieve and help us. Now to ascribe this Knowledge to them, and upon this account to Worship and invoke them, is to be guilty of Idolatry. This we endeavour to demonstrate. 1. From the Reason of those Addresses which we make to God, *viz.* that we believe him to be the Searcher of all Hearts, one that doth see the inward Motions of the Soul, and is acquainted with our most secret thoughts and actions: Now this we have already proved, to be an excellency so proper to the God of Heaven, that it is not ordinarily communicated unto *Saints* and *Angels*; and therefore to ascribe this Knowledge to them, is to ascribe unto them, what is Gods propriety, and consequently to be guilty of Idolatry by Prop. 1. And as a farther evidence, that no such Knowledge is Communicated to the Blessed Angels, either by Revelation, or by the beatifick Vision, consider that from this supposed Communication it would follow, (as it is well suggested by the Learned * *Esthius*) that all those sentences of Scripture, and the Holy Fathers, which attribute this Knowledge of our secret thoughts, and of the in-

* Addamus Angelos ne quidem supernaturaliter de facto cognoscere quaslibet cordium cogitationes quasi hoc eis competat communi lege Beatudinis, nam si ita esset, nondum absolutam haberent veritatem generales sententiæ soli Deo tribuentes notitiam occultarum cogitationum, quandoquidem beneficio beatudinis id esset multis communicatum; sed intelligendæ essent cum limitatione hac aut simili solus Deus naturaliter novit &c. quam utique limitationem nusquam insinuant addendam esse ut sicut absolutè verum maneat solum Deum de facto nosse (quælibet) futura contingentia non obstante eo quod quædam suis amicis revela, ita etiam absolutè verum maneat solum de facto nosse passim (quælibet) occulta Cordium, quoniam ut dictum est Authoritates de utroque loquuntur eodem modo. in senten. l. 2. distinc. 7. § 12. p. 80

ward Motions of the Heart to God alone, would not be absolutely true, but without this limitation, *viz. God only naturally knows them*, or some like exception, they would be absolutely false; And yet this Limitation the *Scriptures* and the holy *Fathers* never do insinuate; so that as it is absolutely true, that unto God alone belongs the knowledge of contingent Beings, although he sometimes did reveal some matters of that nature, to his *Priests* and *Prophets*: nor do we notwithstanding think, that such a Knowledge doth belong to *Saints* and *Angels*; so is it absolutely true, that unto God alone belongs the Knowledge of the inward Thoughts and Secrets of the Hearts, nor have we any reason to conceive, that such a Knowledge ordinarily belongs to *Saints* and *Angels*.

§ 4. 2. To worship any Creature with the Mind, is to be guilty of Idolatry: This was the Antient and undoubted Doctrine of the whole *Church of Christ*; for this St. *Austin* witnesseth, that * *in the Catholick Church, it is divinely and singularly delivered, that no Creature is to be Worshipped by the Soul, but he only, who is the Creator of all things.* But *Roman Catholicks* do, and (upon supposition that they have the Knowledge of the Hearts, and do by seeing God, perceive the Secrets of it; And as *T. G.* asserts, do know both our Necessities and Prayers, Concerns, and Actions; I say, upon this supposition) they ought to worship Saints and Angels, not only with the Body but the Soul; for seeing mental Prayers, Vows, and Thanksgivings, are by all

* Divinè & singulariter in Ecclesia Catholica traditur nullam creaturam colendam esse animæ (libentius enim loquor his verbis quibus mihi hæc insinuata sunt) sed ipsum tantummodo rerum quæ sunt omnium Creatorem. August. l. de quant. animæ. c. 34.

p. 418.

all confessed to be parts of that Religious Worship which our Souls perform to God, to make such Vows, and put up such Petitions and Thanksgivings to the Saints and Angels, must be to Worship Saints and Angels with the Soul: Besides all inward Fear and Reverence, must be the Worship of the Soul. And yet if we may Vow, and Pray, and tender our Thanksgivings to them upon presumption, that they know the inward Motions of our Hearts; we may well be affraid to do these actions Hypocritically, and remisly, upon the same account. We may well dread to think, or vow, or pray amiss; and fear their Anger, and their just Displeasure if we do so: thus to deter us from our secret Sins, the *Stoicks* tell us, not only God, but our good *Dæmon* is in secret with us. And when St. * *Basil* had asserted that these Angels did πανταχοῦ καθορᾷν behold us every where; he adds, that upon this account, the Virgin that was devoted to God ought to reverence those blessed Spirits. And surely then by parity of Reason, if their Knowledge reach unto the Heart and inward Motions of the Soul, we ought to have that Fear and Reverence of them upon us, in reference to all those motions.

* οὐδεὶς γὰρ τούτων ὅστιν ὃς οὐχὶ πανταχοῦ καθορᾷ, αὐτὸς μὲν σώματος ὄμμασιν οὐχ ὁρώμενος, ἀσωμάτῳ δὲ βλέμματι περιλαμβάνων εἰς γνῶσιν τὰ σύμπαντα To. 1. p. 741. A.

3. This may be strongly argued from two Considerations. 1. That the *Jewish Church* had no such practice. 2. That they abstained from this practice, because they did not think this honour to be due to *Angels*, but to God alone. And § 5.

1. I say, the *Jewish Church* had no such practice; for, run over all their Sacred Records, the *Law*,

the *Prophets* and the *Psalms*: Look into their most antient Writers, *Philo Judæus*, and *Josephus*; into their *Litanies*, or forms of Prayer, their *Misnah*, or Traditions, and in all these Records you shall not find one Precept or Example of any Invocation directed to the Saints departed: consider all the Motives which have induced the *Church* of *Rome* to use this practice, and you will find that they are chiefly taken from the *Jewish Records*, and from those sayings of the *Psalms* of *David*, which tell us, *that the* 34 Psal. 7. *Angels of the Lord do pitch their tents about them that fear him, to deliver them*; And that *he gives* 91 Psal. 11. *his Angels charge concerning them, that they dash not their foot against a stone*; Or from those Doctrines which were received by that Church. Besides, they had great evidence, and manifold Examples, that God did Minister his Blessings to them by the holy Angels: an Angel lead them out of *Ægypt*, through the Wilderness, into the Land of *Canaan*, the Law was given to them by the hand of *Angels*, they often did appear unto them in an humane shape, and God himself, when he appeared, was still attended with an Host of *Angels*, and by them they were oft preserved from their Enemies. Sith therefore notwithstanding all these Motives, they never put up one Petition to an *absent Angel*; We have just Reason to believe, that in the judgment of the *Jews*, they had no knowledge of the Heart, or the desires of the Soul, especially when absent from us, and that this honour was not to be given to them, but was intirely to be reserved for the God of Heaven. Add to this, that they do frequently entreat of God, that he would cause those *Angels* to preserve them, Psal. 35. 5, 6, 7. and annoy their Enemies; *Let them be as Chaff*

before

before the wind, saith David, and let the Angel of the Lord chase them; Let their way be dark and slippery, and let the Angel of the Lord persecute them. Why therefore do they never use the Language of the *Church* of *Rome*? Why do they never pray to *Michael the Captain of Gods Host, the vanquisher of evil Spirits, to be their refuge and defence against the Power of the Enemy, to drive away their foes, and overthrow their Machinations*; Why do they never call upon their *Guardian Angel, to take hold of Sword and Buckler, and rise up to help them?* Or to their *valiant Champion* Gabriel, *to rise up to help them against the Malignants, and to be with them against all their Adversaries?*

Horæ Sec. Us. Rom. Manual of Godly prayers 1610. with license. Horæ Sec. Us. Sarum.

3. According to the Doctrine of the *Church* of *Rome*, when they appeared, the *Jews* did sometimes put up their Petitions to them: Why therefore did they not invoke them when absent and invisible, if they had held as doth the *Church* of *Rome*, that being absent they were as able to perceive their supplications, and obtain the Blessings they did want, and that their aid was such an excellent and present help against the violent assaults of a Temptation, and all those Floods of Evils we are continually exposed to? With us consent the Antient Fathers in this matter, * *none that observes the Law of* Mo-

* τοὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἀγγέλους οὐδεὶς τῶν δουλευόντων τῷ Μωϋσέως νόμῳ προσκυνεῖν ἀπέχονται τοῦ προσκυνεῖν οὐρανὸν καὶ τοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ ἀγγέλους πειθόμενοι τῷ νόμῳ, &c. l. 5. p. 234. τὸ προσκυνεῖν οὐρανὸν καὶ τοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ Ἀγγέλοις οὐκ ἰουδαικὸν, παραβατικὸν δὲ Ἰουδαισμοῦ ἐστιν. p. 235.

ses *doth worship Angels: For so to do is not a Jewish Custom, but a transgression of their Customes,*

saith

* Ὁ Ἰακὼβ οὐκ ἄλλον ἢ αὐτὸν Θεὸν παρακαλεῖ, καὶ ὁ Δαβὶδ οὐκ ἄλλον ἢ αὐτὸν Θεὸν παρακαλεῖ περὶ τοῦ βοηθῆσαι. Orat. 4. cont. Arrian.

* Jacob *and* David *did not request deliverance of none but God*, saith *Athanasius*.

Object. § 6. And whereas *T. G.* and the *Roman Catechism*, produce those words of *Jacob*, *the Angel that redeemed me from all evil, bless the Lads*, as an example of this Invocation, and a proof that it was practised by the Antient Jews. If we consider what the Fathers have delivered upon this Text, and how expressly they assert, these words must certainly be understood of Christ: We may admire that any *Roman* Doctor, who stands obliged by his Oath, * *not to Interpret Scripture, but according to the unanimous consent of the Holy Fathers*, should make so little Conscience of that Oath, as to Interpret this, and many other Scriptures, in opposition to the prevailing Judgment of those Fathers.

* Nec eam unquam nisi juxta unanimem consensum patrum accipiam & Interpretabor. Bulla pii 4. super forma juramenti professionis fidei.

2. It is admirable to consider, with what incredible advantage to our cause, the Fathers speak upon this Text: if we had nothing more to say, but what they have delivered on these words, yet should we have what is abundantly sufficient to confirm our Faith, and justifie that Imputation which we lay upon the Church of *Rome*; for, first they do expressly say, that this Exposition of *T. G.* and his Infallible Mother, is not only false, but an heretical exposition. * *If any heretick*, saith Novatian,

* Ac si aliquis Hæreticus pertinaciter obluctans adversus veritatem voluerit in his omnibus exemplis proprie Angelum aut intelligere aut intelligendum esse contenderit in hoc quoque viribus veritatis frangatur necesse est. de Trin. c. 15.

who

who pertinaciously ſtrives againſt the truth, would have us in all theſe Examples properly to underſtand the Angel, or would contend for ſuch a ſenſe of that expreſſion, in this he muſt aſſuredly be broken by the force of truth. This Expoſition of the Papiſts, ſaith St. *Cyril*, is ἀμαθία τῶν χειρομάχων (i. e.) *the ſottiſh expoſition of the* Arians. The Expoſition of the Proteſtants muſt therefore be both true and Orthodox. 2. They add, that * *if the Enemies of Chriſt did think that* Jacob *was a Holy Man, and one endued with the Prophetick ſpirit, when he ſpake theſe words, they might be well aſhamed to charge him with ſo groſs an error, as was the Invocation of an Angel with God.*

Theſaur. p. 115. 116.

* Εἰ ὁ προφητικὸν ἐνυπάρχων χάρισμα τὸν τὰ τοιαῦτα λέγοντα ἐνομολογοῦσιν οἱ χειρομάχοι, καὶ πιστεύουσιν ὄντως ἅγιον ἄνδρα γεγονέναι τὸν Ἰακώβ, ὅτιου δὴ χαεὶν τοιαύτῃ αὐτῷ περιτιθέντες πλάνῃ, οὐκ ἀισχύνται ὡς ἄγγελον σαυάπλειν τῷ πάντων θεῷ καὶ δεδόχθαι συνευλογεῖν τῷ πατριαρχῇ τὸν δὲ αὐτῷ γενόμενον νομίζειν; εἰδὲ τοῦτο ἄτοπον, ἀκουέτωσαν καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν· εἰμὶ μὲν ὄντως πιστεύειν γεγονέναι τὸν Ἰακὼβ, παύσαθω δυσφημοῦντ' αὐτὸ, Cyril, Alexandr. Theſaur. p. 116.

This Cuſtom therefore of putting up the ſame Petition in the ſame ſentence *to God and to the Bleſſed Angel*, or *to God and to the Saints or Angels*, muſt be acknowledged to be a thing * exceedingly repugnant to the Doctrine which then obtained in the Church of Chriſt, and that which they eſteemed the † groſſeſt error. 3. They give us this as a ſufficient Evidence,

* οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο λαβεῖν παρὰ τὰ Πατρὸς καὶ τῆς Ἀγγέλων, ἢ παρὰ πνὸς τῆς ἄλλων κτίσεως μάτην—— εἰ δ' ἂν εἴποί τις δόξῃ σοι ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἄγγελος, Orat. 4 contr. Arr.

† κ' γὰρ ἀνέξεταί τις λέγοντός τινος δόξῃ σοι τὰ ἀετήματά σε Θεὸς τυχὸν ὁ παλαὶρ καὶ ὁ Ἄγγελος· ἀλλ' εἰ δ' ἔστι μίαστον ὀνομάσειν ἀγγέλῳ, μόνῳ γὰ τὸ δεδόνναι πρέπει θεῷ. B. Cyrill, Alexandr. Theſau. p. 115.

that

that *Jacob* ſpake not to a Creature, becauſe he ſaith, *the Angel that delivered me from all evils*. Hence it is manifeſt ſaith *Athanaſius* and St. *Cyril*, that *he did not ſpeak of a created Angel*, but of the Angel of the Covenant: and therefore it is manifeſt, that theſe petitions preſcribed in the *Church* of *Rome*, and often tendred both to Saints and Angels, are in the Judgment of theſe Fathers, ſuch as ought not to be tendred to a Creature, and ſo are guilty of Idolatry: As therefore *Athanaſius* to the *Arians*, ſo ſay I to the *Church* of *Rome*, * *Let them know, that never any good Man put up ſuch a Prayer to any thing that was begotten.* They being taught by Chriſt to pray to God the Father, to be *delivered from all Evil.* And by the Son of *Syrach* to confeſs that *it is he who delivereth from all evil.* And this Interpretation of the Antient Fathers, will manifeſtly appear to be the truth, if we conſider who this Angel was, for the Angel who delivered him from all Evil, muſt be that very Angel which delivered him from *Labans* wrath, and from the fury of his Brother *Eſau*, now the Angel which ſaid unto him I have *ſeen all that* Laban *doth unto thee*, *return thou therefore into the Land of thy Kindred*, was the God of *Bethel*, the God to whom he vowed a vow, that God who did appear in *Haran* to him, it was the God of his Father *Abraham*, and the *fear of Iſaack* that rebuked *Laban*, and charged him not to do him hurt. The *Angel* that he wreſtled with, and with whom he prevailed, was the *God* of Heaven. Laſtly it was his Prayer to this God that made his Brother *Eſau* melt into expreſſions of the greateſt love.

Orat. 4. contra Arian. p. 360.

P. Conter. Arian. Ora 2. p. 369.

Gen. 16. v. 8.

31 Gen. 13. 20.

28 Gen. 13.

v. 29. 42.

32 Gen. 23.

12 Hoſ. 4.

2. I anſwer, this is no Prayer but a Wiſh: thus

thus when St. *Paul* concludes in his Epistle to the Church of *Corinth*, *the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ*, *and the love of God*, *and the Communion of the holy Ghost be with you all.* I hope he doth not pray unto the Grace of Christ, and the Love of God, and the Communication of the holy Ghost: so then, this passage may be thus Expounded, *I wish to God*, *that he*, *and that good Angel who under him*, *preserved me from all evils*, *may preserve the Lads.* 2 Cor. 13. 14.

Some *Roman Catholicks* confess that which we now contend for, and tell us, that although this practice in its self was good and profitable, God would not suffer his own people to invoke these blessed spirits, least they should worship them as Gods: Idolatry being a Vice they were so prone, upon the least occasion to commit. *Answer*, we find, that notwithstanding the proneness of this people to that sin, God often did appear in the similitude of *Angels* to them, he used the Ministry of *Angels* in the delivery of that Law, they did so highly reverence: he used their Ministry both in conferring of the choicest Blessings on his people, and the inflicting of the most remarkable Judgments, both on them, and on their Enemies: And he delivered those things touching the Ministry and custody of holy Angels, which *Romanists* conceive to be sufficient ground and motive for their Invocation. Whence we may very well conclude, it was not out of fear of any proneness of that people to this Idolatry, that he did not enjoyn this practice, but only because he is *a jealous God*, and will not give his honour to another. Against the Worship of an Image, or of the Host of Heaven, or any other Gods, which by the *Heathens* were still worshipped under

Vide Vossium de invoc. Sanct. disp. 2 Th. 18.

under some visible representation, we have frequent Cautions, and very dreadful threatnings in *Moses* and the *Prophets*; but against this Idolatry of Worshiping those spirits, which in their nature are invisible, those writings give us not one Caution or Prohibition, though they do often call them *Gods*, of which affair I am not able to conceive a better Reason then this is, that it was just matter of suspition, that this rude heavy people might be prone to worship what they saw: but it was not to be feared that they should worship what was invisible and seldome did appear; and hence we find this people continually revolting from the invisible *Jehovah*, to the Sun, Moon, and Stars, and to the Heathen Deities: but never do we find them in the least inclined to the worship of these blessed spirits.

§ 8. Moreover if we do consider that in the whole New Testament, we have not any precept to enjoyn; Example to commend, or promise to encourage us unto this Invocation, we have a further reason to believe, that Christ and his Apostles disapproved of it, for can we think that Christ himself, and all his Servants and Apostles, would have neglected to commend unto us some way or other, that Invocation which they themselves approved, and if the *Church* of *Rome* doth not deceive us, did know to be exceeding profitable for the Church of Christ. For, 1. We cannot without Blasphemy conceive, that Christ or his Apostles wanted the knowledge of that great advantage which Christians might receive, by vertue of this supplication; it is no derogation I conceive from *T. G.* or his *Partisans*, to say, that Christ and his Apostles knew, as well as they, what were the proper motives

to

to this practise, and what were the benefits it could bring to the Christian supplicant: nor yet to say that they as heartily desired the Welfare of the Church as doth *T. G*, or the Compiler of the *Roman Catechism*; if then they had conceived as they do, they would undoubtedly have been as exact and punctual in this injunction; it being in it self so highly profitable and the more necessary to be mentioned, because omitted in the Law of *Moses*, and never practised by the *Jews*, especially if we consider that nothing could have been more properly suggested for the consolation of all Christians under those fiery tryals they endured, then this consideration, that they might pray in Faith as doth the *Roman Missal*; *Oh most glorious Angel, the most high hath given thee to be my Refuge, let then no evil come unto me.*

Moreover, the *Church* of *Rome* doth offer this as a present help in trouble; unto this refuge she exhorts us all to fly; **when any violent temptation doth assault and press thee, when any vehement tribulation threatens thee, call then upon thy Guardian Angel, thy Leader and thy helper in due season, in tribulation call upon him, and say, Lord save us we perish.* So the Roman Breviary; and this is their continual practice. Whereas our Heavenly Father doth instruct us thus, *call upon me in the day of trouble, and I will deliver thee*, &c. The *Apostles* and *Evangelists* are very copious and frequent, in suggesting consolations and encouragements, to bear with joy and patience those cruel persecutions, with which

* Quoties gravissima cernitur urgere tentatio & tribulatio vehemens imminere invoca custodem tuum, ductorem tuum, adjutorem tuum in opportunitatibus, in tribulatione; inclama eum, & dic domine salva nos perimus. Brev. in Festo Ang. Cust. lec. 6. ex Bern. in ps. 90. p. 190.

50 Psal. 15.

which the Primitive professors of Christianity were still infested and perplexed; they have delivered many excellent discourses touching the *Comforter*, the presence of their Saviour with them, the Example of his Sufferings, and of that Cloud of Witnesses which laboured under the same fiery tryals; and lastly that exceeding weight of Glory, which they should purchase by those Sufferings, but not one hint have they vouchsafed us of this Comfort, which is administred by the Church of *Rome*. They frequently inform us, that God is able and willing to preserve us from, sustain us under, and give an happy issue to our trouble; they bid us arm our selves against Temptations by Faith and Patience, and assiduity of Prayer, but never tell us that we should pray to any *Angel* for this end. St. *Paul*, when buffeted by Satans Messenger, hath thrice recourse unto our Saviour, but never unto *Raphael* or *Michael*, who by the Church of *Rome* are stiled *tentatorum firma propugnacula*, *the sure Defenders of the tempted*. Elsewhere he tells us, that *being pressed above pleasure, and above strength, insomuch, that he despaired even of Life, he was delivered by that God who raiseth the Dead, in whom*, saith he, *we trust that he will yet deliver us, you also helping together by Prayer for us*, this he expressly tells us were his hopes from the petition of *Surviving Saints*. But then he never gives us the least hint of the like expectation from the Prayers of *Holy Angels*, nor doth he once direct a Prayer to them. Is any sick, saith the *Church* of *Rome*; let him say to his *Guardian Angel*, *O Holy Angel of God assist me as my Keeper*. *To all the Saints* and *Holy Angels* let him say, *O all ye Holy Angels, and all ye Saints inter-*

2 Cor 1. 9, 10 11.

Rituale Rom. p. 117. Ed. Antue. 1617.

intercede for me, and succor me. Is any sick, saith the *Apostle James*, *let him send for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, and the prayer of Faith shall save the sick.* Had he believed that practice of the *Church* of *Rome*, had been the more prevailing means for their recovery; had he conceived it proper and beneficial to the dying person, should we have had no mention of it? no *Rubrick* to direct those *Elders* to mind those dying Christians of this thing? The same *Apostle* doth command all Christians to *confess their faults to one another, and pray for one another, that they may be healed*, and gives this reason of that precept, that *the effectual fervent prayer of any righteous Man, availeth much*; why doth he not exhort them to confess their Sins to *all the Holy Angels*, as doth the *Church* of *Rome*? why doth he never send them to the *Medicinal Angel Raphael*, who, as they do inform us, is *the best Physitian both of Soul and Body*? add to this, that these Apostles have not been only silent in this matter, but they have delivered many things which seem to be repugnant to it, they do expresly teach us, that *our Faith should be in God*, and ask, *how we can call upon him in whom we have not believed.* They say, *if any Man want wisdom* (to direct him how to bear the Cross) *let him ask of God, that giveth to all Men liberally, and upbraideth not: and it shall be given him.* What therefore we are taught by them to seek from our Petitions made to *holy Angels*, St. *James* directs us immediately to ask of God: as being most able, and most kind, and therefore prone to help us. Whence it is easie to collect, that it seems very vain and idle to go to them, who are less able, and less willing so to do. St. *Jude* concludes

5 Jam. 14. 15.

v. 15. 16.

Animarum corporisque optimus Medicator. Hor. Sec. us. Sirum f. 92.

1 Pet. 1. 21.

10 Rom. 14.

1 Jam. 5.

his General Epistle with these words, *to him that*
Jud. 24, 25. *is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless; to the only wise God our Saviour, be Glory and Majesty, Dominion and Power.* To him alone he doth ascribe this Power; to him alone he gives the Glory of all our preservations;
2 Heb. 5. nay they assure us that Christ hath not *subjected* the Christian state unto the *Angels*, as the *Jewish* was; that *they are now our fellow-Servants, and therefore must not be adored*: And that we must be cautious lest any do obtrude upon us
22 Rev. 9. *the worship of those blessed Spirits*: this they deliver without the least suggestion of any of
2 Coloss. 18. those limitations and distinctions which are so frequent in those Writers of the Church of *Rome* which comment on the places mentioned. These blessed *Apostles* were not so careful to prevent the Errors and Mistakes of *Hereticks* in this particular, as are the *Doctors* of the *Roman Church*: they do not seem so tender of the Invotion and Worship of those blessed Spirits, or so sollicitous we may not loose so great a benefit, as are those Roman Doctors; which gives us reason to conjecture, not that their Knowledg or their Piety was less, but that they did not very much aprove that Doctrine which gave the rise unto this *Superstition* of the *Romish Church*, and so much for the first particular.

2. That both the Jews and Christians abstained from this practise; because they did not think this honor to be due to Angels, but to God alone, is evident from what we have discourséd already to confirm this inference: *the Apostles and Evangelists left us no precept or example to put up our petitions to departed Saints, and therefore they conceived it the Worship due to God alone.* 2 Having removed and taken off those reasons which

the

the Romaniſt aſſignes of this neglect, it follows that that reaſon muſt ſtand good which we aſſigne, at leaſt till they can find a better. With us conſent the learned Jews; (*a*) *Joſephus Albus* ſuppoſeth *this Worſhip of the Angels as Mediators betwixt God and us, to be the moſt antique Idolatry*; and (*b*) *Maimon* adds *that the foundation of the precept of Idolatry is this, that no man ſerve or Worſhip any Angel or created being.*

(*a*) Joſeph. Albus, l. 3. in Icarim. c. 18. Idololatriam primam eorum fuiſſe exiſtimans qui Angelos & ſimiles creaturas ut ſequeſtres inter ſe ac Deum collocaſſent ait Deum in Decalogo quando ait *Non erunt tibi Dii alieni ante faciem meam*: id voluiſſe ne homines ullos ponerent ſequeſtres aut deprecatores inter ſe & ipſos. Voſſius in Maim. de Idolol. c. 2. Sect. 1.

(*b*) Fundamentum Mandati de Idololatria eſt nequis Serviat Creaturæ, non Angelo, non Sphæræ, non Stellæ — quanquam autem is qui ea colit ſciat illa non eſſe Deum, ac colat Creaturam hanc quomodo coluit Enos & illius coætanei nihilominus eſt Idololatria. Maim. ibid. Maimonides ſua definitione non tantum ſe complecti ait Eos qui creaturis cultum exhibent, ut Deo, verum qui iis ſupplicant, ut miniſtris Dei. Dionyſ. Voſſius in locum.

As the Foundation of our laſt evidence of that Idolatry which is in this particular committed by the Church of *Rome*, we do premiſe, §. 9.

1. *That Magick is that art of Divination which is converſant about the Revelation of things contingent and concealed*; as *v. g.* touching the victory of contending parties, the future condition of the Church, *&c.* The declaration of our future State, Fortune, Marriage, Death, Proſperity, Adverſity, and many other things which it is very uſeful for Mankind to know.

2 I premiſe that there was amongſt the anti- Alii dicunt hos

eſſe effectus bonorum Angelorum, Delrio diſq. Mag. l. 2. qu. 2. p. 96. B.

ents an oppinion that by the help of Souls departed, or good *Angels*, they might obtain the knowledge of things contingent and concealed: and hence that Divination which they exercised who did pretend to know things secret or contingent, by their means, was called θεουργία, or *white Magick*, in opposition to Divination by evil Spirits, which they stiled γοητία or *black Magick*: *it was a very old opinion especially of the Platonists of Jamblick, Porphyry, Plotinus, Proclus, and Julian the Apostate, that Divination was the effect of holy Angels.* So (a) *Delrio*, (b) *Magicians who observe Angels and Demons are careful to abstain from Wine and Venery, and living creatures*: So St. *Clemens*. And,

(a) Disquis. Mag. l. 2. qu. 2. p. 96. B.
(b) Strom.

3. 3. I premise that this *white Magick* is by the *Church* of *Rome* condemned as *Idolatry*: For *such is all unlawful Magick*, saith (c) *Delrio*, "Whosoever exerciseth the art "of Divination, or consults them "that do it, are guilty of having "other Gods, saith (d) *Estius*, be"cause they attribute unto the "Creature what is Gods propriety, "*viz.* The knowledge of things future, and "which in nature have no certain Causes, but "which depend upon the will of man, or o"ther things which are mutable. *Valentianus* adds, "That they affront his Majesty by a vain "expectation of those things from Creatures "which are to be expected only from God: "for God having said, declare to us things fu"ture that we may know that ye are Gods. "the knowledge of things future and contin"gent must be the knowledge proper unto God "alone. And again the procuration of the know"ledge of things hid, or secret, belongeth to Divine

(c) Tacita Idololatria est omnis Magia prohibita Belrio, l. 1. disqu. Mag. cap. 1. p. 3. Col. 3.
(d) Estius in Sent. 3. dist. 4. Sect. 6. p. 130.

"Divine Worſhip, for theſe are to be expected "only from God by prayer and other lawful "means: when therefore we expect them vain- "ly from the Creature, we do aſcribe unto the "Creature that Worſhip which is properly Di- "vine. Theſe things premiſed,

4. I add, that either this *white Magick* muſt be lawful, or elſe the Invocation of *Saints* and *Angels*, as it is practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, muſt be unlawful, and guilty of Idolatry; either we vainly do expect that they ſhould hear and underſtand our mental Prayers, and know the ſecrets of our Hearts, or the *Magicians* who do expect the knowledge of things ſecret, or contingent by thoſe bleſſed Spirits, cannot be juſtly charged with *Idolatry*: For whatſoever the *Romaniſt* pretends in vindication of the firſt, doth equally excuſe and vindicate the ſecond: for if you do conjecture with the *Church* of *Rome*, that the affection of thoſe bleſſed Spirits to mankind is ſo exceeding great, that, it will prompt them moſt aſſuredly to intercede in our behalf for other temporal concerns, to be our refuge, and *Protectors*, and to Miniſter to the concernements both of this, and of the future life, why may we not conceive that the ſame love ſhould move them to declare thoſe future things which it doth Equally concern us to know, both that we may obtain the greateſt bleſſings, and may be able to fly and to prevent the greateſt perils, or may prepare to bear thoſe evils, with a Chriſtian courage which we cannot eſcape? "When *Florentius* having loſt his Cloak, and T.G. p. "had not where withall to buy another, by pray- 424. "ing to the twenty Martyrs caught a Fiſh with "a Gold Ring in t, ſufficient (I ſuppoſe) to buy another. Caniwe doubt but when we loſe

a Cloak, that praying to *all Saints* and *Angels*, some kind hearted Saint, that perhaps in his life time loſt his own (and ſo muſt be ſuppoſed according to * *T. G.* to be more ready than the reſt to pitty any body that ſuſtains that loſs) will tell us where this loſt Cloak is? If God doth either from the Law of Friendſhip, or for our profit reveal the ſecrets of mens hearts unto them, and inform both *Saints* and *Angels* of our Prayers, and our Neceſſities, why ſhould we not conceive that he is as ready to inform them of thoſe hidden and contingent things, which, it as much concerneth us to be informed of, as to receive an Anſwer to our Prayers, *v. g.* if he informed the twenty Martyrs of *Florentius* his Petition that his Cloak might be given to him, why ſhould he not inform them where it was; or if thoſe bleſſed Spirits do by virtue of the beatifick Viſion ſee our Prayers and Wants, why ſhould they not be thought to view our Loſſes, and our future ſtate in the ſame beatifick Viſion? If that could repreſent unto the twenty Martyrs *Florentius*'s Prayer, why not his Cloak, and where it was? *They who ſee God ſee all things in him which belong unto him*, ſay the *Roman Doctors*, *therefore they ſee the Prayers directed to him, for they objectively muſt be in God, they that ſee God* ſaith the *Magitian*, *ſee all things in him, and therefore they muſt ſee things future and concealed, for they objectively muſt be in God*; and with what ſhew of reaſon can any man reject the latter inference who doth allow the former, for to be the Searcher of the Heart, is not leſs proper to God then is the Knowledge of what is future and contingent? Nay Holy Scripture ſeemes more clearly to appropriate to God the Knowledge of the Heart, then of things future

Part. 3. cap. 2. Sect. 4.

T. G. p. 423, 424.

future and contingent; for it expreſly ſaith *thou only knoweſt the Hearts of men*, but doth not ſo expreſly ſay, thou only knoweſt what is to come. Moreover the ſecret motions of our Heart do equally depend upon our will, which is uncertain, and very ſubject unto change, if therefore it be truly ſaid that what is future and contingent cannot be known by any creature, becauſe it doth depend on what is mutable and therefore to expect this knowledge from a Creature, or to aſcribe it to him is to be Guilty of *Idolatry*; the like muſt be affirmed of the thoughts and inward motions of the Heart, which equally depending on the free motions of the will, muſt be obnoxious to the ſame uncertaintyes.

CHAP. XI.

The CONTENTS.

The Canon of the Councel of Laodicea, de iis qui Angelos Colunt, *is laid down, and the Judgment of* Theodoret *and* Photius *upon it.* Sect. 1. *And it is proved.* 1. *That it contains the Sentence and belief of the whole Church of Christ.* Sect. 2. *That it forbids the Invocation and Worship of Angels.* Sect. 3. *That the Angels whose Invocation and Worship it forbids were blessed Spirits and not evil Angels.* Sect. 4. *That it forbids what is the Practice of the Church of* Rome. Sect. 5. *That it pronounceth the Worship and Invocation of the holy Angels to be Idolatry.* Sect. 6. *That in the Judgment of the Fathers, this was the Worship which St.* Paul *condemned.* 2 Coloss. Sect. 7. *The evasions of* T. G. *confuted.* ibid. *And all the other Answers of the Romanists,* Sect. 8.

§ 1. THat what we have thus confirmed from Scripture and the voice of Reason, hath also the consent, and the concurrent suffrage of Antiquity

tiquity we shall demonstrate, not from the words of any single Father, but from the clear decision of the whole Church of God, which is delivered to us in these words, *viz.* * *That Christians ought not to forsake the Church of God, and depart aside, and invocate Angels, and make meetings which are things forbidden. If any man therefore be found to give himself to this privy Idolatry, let him be accursed. Because he hath forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and betaken himself to Idolatry.* In the Epitomy of Canons collected by *Dionisius Exiguus*, and which Pope *Adrian* delivered to *Charles* the great, this Decree is thus entitled, (*a*) *Canon de his qui Angelos colunt*, a Decree concerning those that worship Angels (*b*) *Crisconius* hath the like. *Theodoret*, who lived in the next Century upon those words of the Apostle, Let no man defraud you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshiping of Angels, writes that (*c*) *They who were zealous for the Law, perswaded men to worship Angels, because say they, the Law was given by them. This did they councel to be done, pretending humility, and saying, that the God of all things was invisible, and inaccessible, and incomprehensible, and that it was fit we should pro-*

* Ὅτι ὲ δεῖ χεισιανὸς ἐγκαλαλείπειν τὴν ἐκκλεσίαν τῦ Θεῦ κ᾽ ἀπέναι, κ᾽ Ἀγγέλως ὀνομάζειν κ᾽ συνάξεις ποιεῖν ἄπερ ἀπηγόρευται. Εἴ τις ὲν ἐυρεθῆ ταυτὴ τῆ κρυπτομένη εἰδωλολατρία ζηλάζων ἔστω ἀνάθεμα ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπεν τ᾽ Κύριον ἡμῶν Ιησῦν Χειςὸν τ᾽ υἱὸν τ᾽ Θεῦ κ᾽ Εἰδωλολατρία προσῆλθεν. Codex Canonum Eccles. Univers. Can. 139.

(*a*) Justel. Cod. Can Eccles. p. 106.

(*b*) Brev. Canon. 90.

(*c*) Οἱ τῷ νόμῳ συνηγορῆντες κ᾽ πρὸ τ᾽ νόμου ἀγγέλες σέβειν ἀυλοῖς εἰσηγοῦντο, διὰ τῦτο λέγοντες δεδῶς τ᾽ νόμον. Τῦτο τοίνυν συνεβάλευον ἐκεῖνοι γίνεδς, ταπεινοφροσύνη δῆθεν κεχρημένοι κ᾽ λέγοντες, ὡς ὁρᾳ τ᾽ ὅλων Θεὸς ἀνέφικτός τε κ᾽ ἀναπόληπ τ᾽, κ᾽ προσήκει διὰ τ᾽ Ἀγγέλων τ᾽ θείαν συμένειαν προσγμαλίνεδ. Theodoret. in Coloss. c. 2.

cure

cure Gods favor by the means of Angels. And again (*a*) *Because they commanded men to worship Angels* (saith Theoderet) *he enjoyneth the contrary, that they should adorn their words and deeds with the Commemoration of our Lord Christ: and send up thanksgiving to God and the Father by him and not by the Angels. The Synod of* Laodicea *also following this Rule, and desiring to heal that old disease made a Law that they should not pray to Angels, nor forsake our Lord Jesus Christ.* And lastly, (*a*) *This vice* (saith he) *continued in* Phrygia *and* Pisidia *for a long time. For which cause also the Synod assembled in* Laodicea, *the chief City of* Phrygia *forbad them by a Law to pray to Angels, and even to this day among them and their Borderers, there are Oratories of St.* Michael *to be Seen.* The like hath *Oecumenius* upon the same place, saying, that (*b*) *this Custom continued in* Phrygia, *insomuch that the Councel of* Laodicea *did by a Law forbid to come to Angels and to pray unto them. From whence it is also, that there be many Churches of* Michael *the Cheif Captain of Gods Host among them.* This Canon of the *Laodicean Fathers*, *Photius* doth note to have been made against the (*c*) *Angelites*, or the *Angelicks* rather. For so

* Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι τοὺς Ἀγγέλους σεβειν ἐκέλυον, αὐτὸς τὸ ἐναντίον παρεγγυᾷ, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς λόγους καὶ τὰ ἔργα κοσμῆσαι τῇ μνήμῃ τῶν δεσποτῶν Χριστοῦ. Καὶ τῷ Θεῷ δὲ καὶ πατρὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν δι' αὐτοῦ φησιν ἀναπέμπειν, μὴ δι' ἀγγέλων τοῦτῳ ἑπομένη τῷ νόμῳ καὶ ἡ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ Σύνοδος καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ἐκεῖνο πάθος θεραπεῦσαι βουλομένη ἐνομοθέτησε μὴ εὔχεσθαι ἀγγέλοις, μηδὲ καταλιμπάνειν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. Id. in Col. 2.

(*a*) Ἔμεινε δὲ τοῦτο τὸ πάθος ἐν τῇ Φρυγίᾳ καὶ Πισιδίᾳ μέχρι πολλοῦ τοῦ δὴ χάριν ἡ συνελθοῦσα Σύνοδος ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ τῆς Φρυγίας, νόμῳ κεκώλυκε τὸ τοῖς Ἀγγέλοις προσεύχεσθαι· καὶ μέχρι δὲ τοῦ νῦν εὐκτήρια τοῦ ἁγίου Μιχαὴλ παρ' ἐκείνοις καὶ τοῖς ὁμόροις ἐκείνων ὀστὶν ἰδεῖν. Id. in Col. 2.

(*b*) Oecumen MS. in Coloss. 2. apud Hœchelium in Origenem contra Celsum. In libris editis desideratur.

(*c*) Περὶ ἀγγελιτῶν Phot. Nomocanon tit. 12. c. 9.

so St. (*a*) *Augustin* names those *Hereticks*, *that were inclined to the worship of Angels*, being from thence called (*b*) *Angelici*, as *Isidorus* noteth, because they did worship Angels. Now that the strength of what we argue from this Canon.

(*a*) Angelici, in Angelorum cultum inclinati Aug. de hæres. c. 39.

(*b*) Angelici vocati quia Angelos colunt. Isidor. Orig. l. 8. c. 5.

And that the vanity of what the Romanists except against it, may appear,

1. Let it be noted, that *the forementioned Canon containeth the Sentence and Belief of the whole Church of Christ*, for it is a Canon of that Code, which the whole Christian World did use both in their Councils and Ecclesiastical Judicatures, untill the Seventh Century; and which is cited both by the Council of *Calcedon* and of *Ephesus*, as (*a*) *the order of Canons*, *the series of Ecclesiastical Laws*, *the Ecclesiastical constitutions*, *and* (*b*) *the Code*; It is a Canon of that Code to which the Council of *Calcedon* gave the force, and the Authority of an universal Law in these Expressions, ( ) *we think it equal that the Canons made by Holy Fathers in every Synod untill now*, *should be observed*. § 2. Can. 1.

(*a*) Κατα τὴν τῶν κανόνων τάξιν. ex Concil. Ephes. act. 1. p. 2. p. 327. To. 1. Concil. General. Edit. Rom. (*b*) Διὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν θεσμῶν ἀκολουθίαν act. 2. p. 400. παρὰ τὴν τῶν κανόνων ἀκολουθίαν p. 426. v. p. 425. p. 491. Κατα τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν ἁγίων κανόνων ex Concil. Calced. act. 3. p. 241. Tom. 2. Concil. (*c*) Ἀπὸ Βιβλίου ἀνεγνωταῦτα. act. 4. p. 297. vid. Justel. Cod. Canon. p. 6. —— 12.

2. Observe that what the Canon thus expresseth, *viz.* that *Christians should not name the Angels*; is an *Anathema* directed against those which § 3.

which pray to Angels, ſo *Theodoret* and *Photius*, who call upon them for help or introduction to God. So *Zonaras* and *Ariſtenus*, who worſhipt them. So *Theodoret*, *Dionyſius*, *Chriſtonius*, and the *Epitome* of *Canons* preſented by *Pope Adrian* to *Charles* the great; who ſaid, *we muſt be brought to God by Angels*; ſo *Ariſtenus* and the *Amerbachian Scholiaſt*; and that to cure that Diſeaſe, the Council did command all Chriſtians not to pray unto them, ſo *Theodoret* and *Oecumenius*. And therefore evident it is, that *Zonaras* doth truly ſay, that *to name Angels*, in this *Canon*, *was as much as to invoke them*: whence it will follow, that the whole Church of Chriſt for two whole Centuries and upwards, did forbid all Chriſtians to Invoke Angels, to worſhip or to call upon them, and did pronounce *Anathema*'s on them that did ſo.

In locum

In locum.

Ὁρόμαζόν τινες ἀγγέλους ἐπικαλεῖν.

§ 4. 3. Obſerve that what this Canon doth forbid, was not the Invocation of wicked *Dæmons*, or of Damned Spirits, but of the Bleſſed Angels. For, 1. According to *Theodoret* and *Photius*, they did condemn the worſhipers of *Michael*, the Archangel, and thoſe that went unto the Oratories or Churches of St. *Michael*. 2. The Canon doth relate to *Chriſtians*, who ſurely would not meet to worſhip *Devils*, nor doth it recall them to *good Angels*, but to *Jeſus Chriſt*. 3. The perſons reprehended are ſaid to have took up this Cuſtom of going thus to good *Dæmons*, from a pretence of their unworthineſs, to go to God or Chriſt *immediately*, and from an appearance of humility: So *Chryſoſtome*, *Theodoret*, and others; but to expect the help of Devils to introduce them to God, and to pretend humility in doing ſuch an horrid act, is to be guilty of the higheſt madneſs. 4. *Theodoret*

ret and *Photius* inform us, that they who brought up that forbidden practice, were zealous for the Law; now that most strictly did forbid the worship of all evil spirits, and it was delivered not by them, but by the Blessed Angels.

§ 4. 4. That which is here forbidden, is what the Church of *Rome* doth daily practice, for they do worship Angels, saith the Roman Catechism; this is, and hath been their perpetual Custom to call upon them, and to expect their help and patronage, by vertue of those supplications: Hence that Expression of the *Roman Missal* (*a*) *To them with confidence let's pray, for Gods assistance every day.* They do expect Salvation from their intercession, in that very sense in which *Theophylact* asserts the Hereticks expected to be saved by Angels, *viz.*, ὡς ὑπουργοῦντες as persons ministring unto our Introduction to God and Christ: Hence their petitions, that (*b*) by the intercessions of the blessed Angels, they may obtain Gods favour, and may be brought to Life Eternal. If then that Invocation which is here forbidden be *Idolatry*, the practice of the *Church* of *Rome* must be so too.

Part 3. p. 434.

(*a*) Hos fidenter deprecemur ut ab ipsis adjuvemur apud deum jugiter. Prosa ad S. Angelos, f. 32. B.

(*b*) Hostias tibi Domine laudis offerimus suppliciter deprecantes ut easdem Angelico interveniente suffragio & placatus accipias & ad salutem nostram provenire concedas. Missa votiva de Angelis. p. 5. 36. Ed. Ant. fol. Gaudium erit tibi Angele dei super me peccatore—tuis intercessionibus *deum obtinente.* Missa in honorem proprii Angeli f. 16. B. Ed. Antuerp. 80. 1577.

Angelorum concio sacra, & Archangelorum turma inclyta, nostra *diluant* jam *peccata, præstando supera cæli Gaudia.* Prosa de omnibus sanctis ibid. f. 33. B.

§. 6. 5. This Invocation of the Blessed Angels, is expresly said to be *Idolatry*: and therefore, if it be

be not truly ſo, this *Synod* and the *Church* of *Chriſt* muſt be pronounced falſe accuſers; now of this enormity, they could not juſtly be accuſed for deſerting Chriſt; for, notwithſtanding this, they did not look upon thoſe Angels they invoked as Gods, but as inferiour Creatures; and ὑπουργοῦντες τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ προσαγωγῇ, or perſons inſtrumental and ſubſervient unto our Introduction to God; and therefore thought we ſhould procure Gods favour by the means of Angels, becauſe that God himſelf was not to be approached or apprehended, and becauſe Chriſt was ſo exalted, that they durſt not make their immediate addreſſes to him, now to think Chriſt greater than that we ſinful Creatures ſhould make addreſſes to him, maketh ſome ſhew of our humility, but cannot poſſibly be charged with Idolatry. For ſhould any Man conceive himſelf unworthy to appear before God, or look upon him as unacceſſable by one of ſo defiled a ſpirit, and therefore ſhould entreat the Prayers of his pious Neighbors, we might conclude that he was very ignorant and vain in his imaginations, but could not thence conclude, that he was guilty of Idolatry. And ſo the Reader ſees, that notwithſtanding theſe miſtakes of the *Angelicks*, the *Church* of *Rome* hath no wrong done them, when we charge their Invocation of the bleſſed *Angels* with Idolatry; for if the Invocation of them when abſent were not guilty of this Crime, theſe by-miſtakes could never make it guilty of that imputation. Beſides the *Synod* and *Theodoret* do put a clear diſtinction betwixt theſe two particulars, which by the Expoſition of the *Roman Doctors* are confounded, and made to ſignify the ſame, *viz.* deſertion of Chriſt, and being guilty of *Idolatry*, by praying to the bleſſed

sed Angels, as is apparent from this expression of *Theodoret*; *the Synod of Laodicea made a Law that Christians should not pray to Angels, nor forsake the Lord Christ; whosoever doth such things*, say they, *accursed let him be; because he hath deserted Christ, and given up himself unto Idolatry.* Lastly, we do not find that they did so reject or desert Christ, as to deny his intercession in the Heavens, but only, upon this account, because they did not make immediate addresses to him. For as St. *Paul* asserts, that the *Galatians* had *deserted him that called them*, because, they joyned the observation of the Law to the profession of the Gospel of Christ, so doth St. *Paul*, and the *Laodicean Fathers* declare, that those *Angelicks* had deserted Christ, because, they joyned the Mediation of the blessed *Angels*, to Christ, the *only Mediator* of his Church. 1 Gal. 6.

6. Let it be noted, that those *Fathers* and *Interpreters* do with one mouth affirm, that what this *Canon* thus condemned, was what St. *Paul* had long before condemned in his Epistle to the *Colossians*; and therefore that St. *Paul* did in the judgment of those *Fathers*, condemn the worship and invocation of the blessed *Angels* as *Idolatry*. *Theodoret* expresly saith, that *because they commanded men to worship Angels, he enjoyneth the contrary; that they should adorn their words and their deeds with commemoration of our Lord Christ: and send up thanksgiving to God and the Father by him, and not by the Angels*: to this *T. G.* replies, "That these words of *Paul*, *viz.* "*in a voluntary humility, and not holding the head*, "sufficiently intimate a particularity in the wor-"ship which St. *Paul* condemned, and this was "saith St. *Crysostome* that some among the *Co-*"*lossians* said that we ought *to be rceonciled*, and

§. 7.

P. 378.

οὐ δεῖ ἡμᾶς δία τοῦ γενεῖ προσαγεσθαι ἀλλὰ δία τῶν Ἀγγέλων.

"and have access to the Father not by Christ, "but by the Angels; and this saith he, is that "which is said (*id est*, condemned) by the Apo-"stle, that they so admitted and worshiped the "Angels for Mediators, as to exclude Christ. *Ans.* In this Reply according to *T. G.* his constant custom we have two horrid falsifications of the words of *Chrysostome*: For, 1. These words *we ought to be reconciled*, are disingenuously added to the words of *Chrysostome*, that he might seem to say that they whom *Paul* condemned did attribute unto the *Angels* our reconcilement unto God. 2. What he asserts to to be assigned as a reason why St. *Paul* condemned their Worship, is in St. *Chrysostome* a reason why they were* pufft up, and did pretend humility, but is not assigned as a reason why St. *Paul* condemnes this worship.

* Πῶς ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἢ πως φυσιούμενος; δείκνυσι κενοδοξίας ὂν τὸ πᾶν· τί δὲ ὅλως ἐστὶ τὸ λεγόμενον; ἦσαν τινες οἱ λέγοντες, οὐ δεῖ ἡμᾶς διὰ τῶν Χριστοῦ προσάγειν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν Ἀγγέλων· ἐκεινο γὰρ μεῖζόν ἐστιν ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς. Chrysost. in locum.

3. He doth expresly say that *because these men introduced Angels*, *St.* Paul *in opposition to them did exhort us to do all by Invocation of the name of Christ, and not to introduce the Angels*; now he that doth exhort us, *whether we eat or drink or whatsoever else we do*, before we set upon it, to put up our Petitions to him: and then adds μὴ τοὺς Ἀγγέλους ἐπεισάγετε must in all reason be supposed to forbid us to put up our petitions to them, in reference to any thing we do.

p. 378. *T. G.* proceeds to tell us that "the reason why "they excluded Christ from reconciliation is given by *Theophilact*,* because they esteemed it

* Ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἀναξιόν ἐστι τῆς μεγαλειότητος τοῦ μονογενοῦς τὸ προσάγειν ἡμᾶς τῷ πατρὶ καὶ μεῖζον ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην σμικρότητα.

a

a thing unworthy of the Majeſty of the only begotten Son *on the one ſide to make the Reconciliation*, and far tranſcending Mans poverty and lowneſs *on the other*. Reply, 'Tis an old ſaying, and a true, that one Ly begets an other. Thus *T. G.* having falſly cited *Chryſoſtom*, he gives as falſe a Reaſon of what he never ſaid. For doth *Theophylact* ſay, *they eſteemed it unworthy of Chriſt, on the other ſide to make the Reconciliation?* no *T. G.* confeſſeth, that he doth not, by putting this in a different Character from the words of *Theophylact*: doth he ſay that ſomething was eſteemed unworthy, but doth not tell us what that was, that ſo *T. G.* might have ſome colour for ſaying it was *reconciliation*? No, he expreſly ſaith, *they deemed it beneath Chriſt, to bring us unto God, or to procure our acceſs unto him*; and that it was beyond our meannes immediately to go unto him. Do any of the latter Scholiaſts, ſince that this practice was uſed in the Church of Chriſt, ſuggeſt this ſenſe? No, they expreſſely ſay, that which theſe Hereticks aſſerted was ὅτι οὐ δεῖ τὸν Χριστὸν ὑπαγορεύειν εἰς βοήθειαν, ἢ εἰς πρεσβυγωγὴν τὴν πρὸς Θεόν· that we ought not to pray to Chriſt for his aſſiſtance, or introduction to the Father. Muſt that expreſſion μεῖζον ἦ κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον σμικρότητα be thus expounded, *To make this reconciliation, a thing far tranſcending Mans lowneſs*? No, St. *Chryſoſtom* and all the Scholiaſts do manifeſtly ſay the contrary, and they all expound it thus, that *Chriſt was greater then that we ſhould go unto him*, and that to be introduced by Chriſt, was a thing greater then we could expect. Or laſtly, doth the Word πρεσβεύειν or πρεσβυγωγὴ import this Reconciliation? no, the proper import of πρεσβεύειν is to procure acceſs, and they

Balſamon Zonaras Ariſtenus.

were called προσαγωγεῖς who obtained admiſſion or favour for the ſupplicant.

p. 379. Thirdly, he anſwers, that St. *Paul*, and "the Council of *Laodicea* (in the Judgment of "*Theodoret*, forbad the worſhiping or praying "to *Angels*, upon account that the Law was de- "livered by them, (and therefore, as *Theophy-* "*lact* ſaith, they brought us Salvation) Anſwer, As if *Theophylacts* aſſertion, who lived above 400 years after this Council met, were to be valued, when both *Theodoret* and *Photius* and *Chryſoſtom*, who lived almoſt 400 years before him, gave not one *item* of it, but do aſſign ſuch reaſons of that Prohibition, as nothing do relate unto it. (2.) It is falſe, that *Theophylact* affirms, that they who prayed to *Angels*, becauſe the Law was delivered by them, did therefore ſay they brought us Salvation; for he aſſerts not that this Law was made againſt Judaizing Chriſtians, as doth *Theodoret* and *Photius*, but againſt thoſe who from pretences of humility, exclu- ded Chriſt. (3.) To be ſo far our Saviours only, as to bring or to diſcover the tydings of Salvation to us, is no otherwiſe to be our Saviours, then were the Bleſſed *Apoſtles* and *Evangeliſts*; and ſo to worſhip them as ſuch, is but to worſhip them as *Papiſts* do St. *Paul* and Peter. (4.) This will be more apparent from his words. * *They ſaid it was unworthy of the Majeſty of Chriſt, to bring us to the Father, and that it was beyond them to deſire it, and that*

* Ελεγον δὲ ὅτι ἀνάξιον ἐστι τῆς μεγαλειότητος τοῦ μονογενοῦς τὸ προσάγειν ἡμᾶς τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ μεῖζον ἢ κατὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπίνην αὐτῶν κεῖσθαι τὸ ἐθέλειν προσεύχεσθαι· ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι, φασὶν, ἐξ ἑτέρου λέγειν, ὅτι οἱ ἄγγελοι τὸν νόμον ἐνεχείρισαν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ προσαγωγῇ· ὃν τοῦτον ὄντα σωτῆρα τῶν ἀγγέλων θρησκείαν, καὶ ὑπεύθυνον τὸν ἀφελεσθέντα τούτοις προσεύχεσθαι, ὡς σώσαντα ἡμᾶς.

for

fore did conceive it more agreeable to reason to think that Angels ministred to our Introduction, and hence they introduced the worship of Angels, and perswaded the more ignorant to go unto them, ὡς σωτῆρσιν ἡμᾶς i. e. ὡς ὑπηρέταις τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ πρόσοδῳ to those that saved us by ministring unto our Introduction to God, from whom we do obtain Salvation, and thus the Papists also do perswade the ruder people to look upon them as their Saviours, for by the *suffrage* of the *Holy Angels* they hope *to obtain Salvation*, and by the intercession of their *Guardian Angel*, they hope *to enjoy God*, and therefore in this language call upon him, *Say unto my Soul, thou art my Salvation*—— We meet with many other answers to this *Canon*, and to that passage of St. *Paul* in *Perroon*, *Bellarmine*, *Petavius*, amounting to this only, That they forbid only that supplication, which was tendred to them *as to Gods*, or as to *primary* and *only Mediators*. But (1.) the Canon speaks of Christians, now to suppose that they, whose Fundamental Principle it is to own one only God, should also worship Angels as God, is the extremity of folly (2.) *Theodoret* and *Jerom* declare, that they who did abet this Doctrine were Jews, or persons zealous of the Law, Now these Men knew that Angels were but the Instruments and Creatures of God, and therefore could not worship them as Gods. (3.) They chose these Angels as fit persons to introduce them to God, and used their Meditation upon this pretence, that such mean persons should not go directly to him, and therefore could not look upon them as partakers of the nature of God.

Epist. ad Algasiam quest. 10.

In a word, what can be more incredible then that St. *Paul* being assisted by the Holy Spirit, § 8.

and the whole Church of Christ, ſhould daily practice this worſhip, and Invocation of the Holy Angels, and teach all Chriſtians ſo to do, and yet affirm theſe things without any limitation or diſtinction, which if we may interpret them according to the plain and obvious meaning of the words, do manifeſtly condemn that which they did daily practice, and lay upon Saint *Paul*, and the whole *Church* of *Chriſt*, on ſuppoſition of this practice, the imputation of *Idolatry*, and of deſerting our Bleſſed Lord, and ſhould deliver and approve theſe things, as the Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith, which all Men ſtood obliged to believe. Nothing can be more contrary unto the worſhip and Invocation of theſe bleſſed Spirits, then an expreſs command, that we ſhould neither worſhip nor Invoke them, can it then enter into the heart of any ſober perſon to believe, that the whole Church of Chriſt, even when they taught and practiſed both, ſhould make, receive, and in their Univerſal *Synods* ſhould ſolemnly confirm a Law, without diſtinction or exception, forbidding both the worſhip and Invocation of them, and requiring all good Chriſtians to avoid this practice, as being the deſerting of their Saviour, and the giving of Gods worſhip to thoſe Spirits? Since this Devotion hath obtained in the Church of *Rome*, who ever heard of any Romaniſt, who roundly and without diſtinction, would aſſert, that to invoke an Angel was Idolatry, or that this Invocation was forbidden by the Church of Chriſt, as doth *Theodoret* and *Photius*, and the *Laodicean Council*? who of them ever cautioned all Chriſtian people, as St. *Paul* hath done, *that no Man ſhould ſeduce them* to the worſhip of thoſe Bleſſed Spirits? What *Coun-*

cil

*ei*ever did decree, that they ſhould not be worſhipped or invoked, or own ſuch Doctrine as any part of Chriſtian Faith? And yet we find this done both by Saint *Paul*, and by the *Laodicean Council*, by *Origen*, *Theodoret*, and *Photius*, and the whole *Church* of *Chriſt*; *viz.* what they confirmed by their daily practice, they not only did forbid, but they pronounced it to be *Idolatry* and the *deſerting of their Saviour*, what they had thus decreed in oppoſition to their own daily practice, that they obtruded as a dictate of the Holy Ghoſt, and as the matter of their Faith; but againſt the worſhiping of Angels with Divine Worſhip, or as ſole or primary Mediators, which (if we may believe the Church of *Rome*) was the only thing in which they did offend, we have no mention in the leaſt. That there were in the world ſuch Hereticks, as ſaid it was beyond us, or was too great an arrogance to go directly to the Son of God, and that God was Inacceſſible, and therefore we muſt go to Angels, this *Synod* I ſuppoſe muſt know as well as *Chryſoſtom* and *Theodoret*, why therefore do they never mention as do the latter Comments on this *Canon*, what they alone deſigned to prevent? Why do they not recall theſe Hereticks unto that invocation of theſe Bleſſed Angels, which had obtained in the Church of Chriſt, and tell them that they need not to deſert the Church, or gather private conventicles in order to the Invocation of theſe Angels? Why do not they or or any other perſon, that flouriſhed in the fourth or fifth Ages of the Church, when this injunction was in force, diſtinguiſh between the Invocation of the Holy Angels, which the Church did practiſe, and that which was forbidden by this

Canon? Why doth S.* *Origen* conclude that *Celsus* had not read that passage of St. *Paul* to the *Colossians*, *because he said the Worship of the Holy Angels was no transgression of their Law?* For what is this but to suggest that this text of Scripture is so plain against the worship of them, that he that reads it cannot think that they who own it can admit that Worship? Why doth *Theodoret* affirm that *because Hereticks commanded men to worship Angels*, S. Paul *enjoyned the contrary*; for what is contrary to a command to worship Angels but an injunction not to Worship Angels? Why doth he say that *the Apostle doth command us to send up our Thanksgivings by Christ, and not by the Angels*, for by whom we may send up our *Petitions* why may we not send up *Thanksgiving too?* Why doth both he and *Photius* inform us that the *Laodicean Synod* being desirous to heal this old disease enjoyned Christians μὴ εὔχεσθαι Ἀγγέλοις, Ἀγγέλοις μὴ προσεύχεσθαι, *not to pray to Angels?* For is not this a shrewd suspition that this *Idololatrical disease*, was only that of praying to Angels; or else that both *Theodoret* and *Photius* were such intolerable dolts as to represent the very practise of the Christians as the disease of the Idolaters, and the desertors of our Blessed Lord? Why is it lastly that St. *Chrysostom* informes us that for a cure of this disease St. *Paul enjoyned all Christians to invoke the name of Christ, and not to bring in Angels*, suggesting this unto us, that the Invocation of Angels was not consistent with that of Christ, and that by saying *do all things in the name of Christ*

* παρὰ δὲ τῷ Παύλῳ ἀκριβῶς τὰ Ἰουδαίων παιδευθέντι τοιαῦτ' ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς λέλεκται, μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβευέτω ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ, τῶν ἀγγέλων——ταῦτα δὲ μητ' ἀναγνοὺς μητέ μαθὼν ὁ Κέλσος οὐκ οἶδα ὅπως πεποίηκεν ὡς οὐ παρανομοῦντας Ἰουδαίους προσκυνεῖν τῷ οὐρανῷ. καὶ τοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ ἀγγέλοις. l. 5. contra Celsum. p. 236.

Christ, he hath commanded us to pray unto him, and call upon him as our helper, and not upon the holy Angels? Who knows not that a ſentence againſt any perſon ought in ſome words or other to ſpecify the crime that it condemns, and that an act ſo framed as to condemn a perſon as guilty of the higheſt crimes and worthy of the ſevereſt puniſhments for doing what in the plain and literal meaning of the words all they that framed the act and they that owned it as a Law did dayly practiſe, is an abſurdity that Humane Nature cannot poſſibly be guilty of? When therefore I can find an Act of Parliament, intending only to condemn Inceſtuous converſation, framed thus, *whoſoever ſhall marry any Woman let him be ſeverely puniſhed*; or a decree of any Council, intending only to forbid us to go to the Aſſembly of Hereticks, thus worded, *Whoſoever ſhall go to Church let him be Anathema*; then ſhall I think this Synod and the whole Church of Chriſt, intending only to forbid ſuch invocation of the Bleſſed Angels as made them Gods, or ſole and primary Mediators, would make a Law Μὴ εὐχεσθαι Ἀγγέλοις not to pray to Angels, and thus decree, whoſoever ſhall go and invocate the Angels let him be Anathema. When I can find that ſuch determinations and decrees ſhall paſs for current in a Church or Nation without all limitation, or reſtriction for ſome hundred years, though contradictory to what they practiſe and believe, then ſhall I be induced to believe this Canon could be thus admitted and confirmed as a Law of the whole Church of Chriſt in contradiction to their Faith and practiſe.

CHAP. XII.

The CONTENTS.

The Invocation of Angels confuted from the Teſtimony of Irenæus *and St.* Auguſtin, &c. Sect. 1. *From the Teſtimonies of* Origen. Sect. 2. *The exceptions of* T. G. *againſt them largely confuted.* Sect. 3. *The Teſtimony cited from* Origen. Hom. in Ezech. *conſidered.* Sect. 4.

TO this ſo pregnant Teſtimony of the whole Church of Chriſt, we ſhall adjoyn ſuch ſayings of the antient fathers as do directly overthrow this doctrine, or manifeſtly affirm that no ſuch practiſe was allowed by the Church of Chriſt. Thus in the ſecond Century it is declared by *Irenæus, that the Church of Chriſt did nothing by the Invocation of Angels but purely, ſimply, and openly addreſſed her prayers to God, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, To this " *T. G.* Replies that

*Non eſt numerum dicere Gratiarum quas per univerſum Mundum Eccleſia a Deo accipiens in nomine Chriſti Jeſu crucifixi ſub Pontio Pilato per ſingulos dies in opitulationem Gentium perficit —— neque ſeducens, aliquem nec pecuniam ei auferens, nec invocationibus Angelicis, faciat (i. facit) aliquid nec incantationibus, nec aliqua prava curioſitate, ſed mundè, purè, & manifeſtè orationes dirigens ad Dominum qui omnia fecit, & nomen Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti invocans, virtutes ſecundum utilitates hominum, ſed non ad ſeductionem perfecit, Iren. l. 2. c. 57.

Irenæus

"*Irenæus* ſpeaks only of ſuch ſuperſtitious Invo-
"cating of *Angels*, as was uſed by the *Martio-*
"*nites*, and *Carpocratians* in their Magical ope-
"rations, and working of falſe Miracles. *p.*388.
Repl. 1. The words of *Irenæus* do abſolutely ſay that *Chriſtians did nothing by the Invocation of angels*; which if *T. G.* will limit thus, he ſtands obliged in equity, and and by the Laws of Diſputation to give ſome reaſon of that limitation, which ſince he hath not done, it is apparent that he hath anſwered nothing to the Doctors argument. But, 2. what he replyes, as it is abſolutely groundleſs, ſo is it falſe and inconſiſtent with the words of *Irenæus*: For he doth manifeſtly diſtinguiſh betwixt thoſe magical operations and the invocation of holy Angels, and affirms that the Church doth nothing *by incantations, or by Angelick invocations.* 3. He doth oppoſe unto this Angelick invocation, the invocation and directing of our Prayers purely to God and Chriſt. What therefore he aſcribes thus purely unto God and Chriſt, he muſt be deemed to deny to Angels, and conſequently muſt deny that they directed their petitions to them. Beſides why doth he tell us, that the Church addreſſeth her petitions *to that God who made all things*, if not to ſhew that this was the true reaſon of our praying to him alone, ſeeing he only is the maker of all things? 4. He manifeſtly ſpeaks of the miraculous gifts of Chriſtians in curing diſeaſes and caſting out of Devils, which things not only *Irenæus*, but * *Origen* affirmes to be performed only by the

* Οὐδὲν ἄλλο κολοῦντες ἐπὶ τοὺς δεομένους θεραπείας ἢ τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεὸν καὶ τὸ Ἰησοῦ ὄνομα, μετὰ τῆς περὶ αὐτοῦ ἱστορίας. lib. 3. contra Celſum. p. 124. l. 1. p. 7.

invocation

invocation of the name of God and Christ. *Lactantius* tels us that * *the holy Angels will not have any honor bestowed on them, because their honor is in God and they have nothing else to do but to obey.* *S. Chrysostome* is very copious on this subject; For (1.) he tels us the Devil brought in τὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων (*i. e.* The Calling upon Angels as is apparent from its opposition to calling upon God) and that, saith he, he doth *endeavoring to rob us of this honor* (of going unto God by Christ alone) as is apparent from the words preceding (*a*) *do all things by God, and introduce not Angels.* And lastly, he concludes in these expressions, (*c*) *be he Angel, or Archangel, or Cherubim, do not suffer it; for neither will these powers receive this honor but reject it, when they see their Lord dishonored. I have honored thee, saith God and have said call upon me, and dost thou dishonour him?* Again, * *Why gape ye (saith he) after Angels they are our fellow servants?* Now from that very name the Fathers argue that they are not to be adored. Hence (*d*) *Athanasius* concludes *no Creature ought to adore his fellow Creature though he be an Angel, because the Angel said to John, see thou do it not, I am thy fellow servant.* And, *Gregory Nazianzen* saith (*e*) *If I adore the Creature what shall I say to the Idolatrous Heathen, since I my self adore my fellow servants: For Creatures are all servants, though some more excellent than others.*

* Ille autem preses Mundi & rector Universi qui scit omnia, cujus divinis oculis nihil septum est, solus habet rerum omnium cum Filio suo potestatem nec in Angelis quicquam nisi parendi necessitas itaque nullum sibi honorem tribui volunt quorum omnis honor in Deo est. l. 2. c. 16.

(*a*) Κατὰ Θεὸν πάντα, πράττετε μὴ τοὺς Ἀγγέλους ἐπεισάγετε.

(*c*) Hom. 9. in Epist. ad Coloss. Tom. 4. p. 139.

* Hom. 3. ad Heb. p. 443.

(*d*) κτίσματι γὰρ κτίσμα οὐ προσκυνεῖ, ἀλλὰ δοῦλος δεσπότην. &c. Orat. 3. p. 394.

(*e*) Τι φήσω πρὸς τοὺς τὴν Ἀστάρτην προσκυνοῦντας —— αὐτὸς προσκυνῶν τὰ ὁμόδουλα; δοῦλα γὰρ καὶ εἰ σμικρὸν τιμιώτερα. Nazianz. Orat. Quadragessim. p. 658, 669.

Of

Of the ſame judgement was St. *Auguſtin* who ſpeaks thus; * *Whom ſhould I find that might reconcile me unto thee? ſhould I have gone unto the Angels? With what Prayer? With what Sacraments? many endeavoring to return unto thee, and not being not able to do it by themſelves, as I here have tryed thoſe things, and have fallen into the deſire of curious viſions, and were accounted worthy of illuſions.* Elſewhere he tels us, *thoſe bleſſed Spirits, however they are called, are no Mediators to bring miſerable mortals to bleſſedneſs and immortality*, where, ſaith the Doctor, "It would be ridiculous to diſtinguiſh between "Mediators of Redemption and Interceſſion: "for all that they attributed to their good Spi- "rits was only Interceſſion: to this *T. G.* Re- plyes, that *this is manifeſtly falſe*, and that Doctor *Stillingfleet not only contradicts the Truth, but himſelf too*, to wit becauſe he had before affirmed that *the Ægyptian Dæmons*, ſaith Celſus, *healed the diſeaſes of the parts proper to themſelves*: and therefore might juſtly be Invocated. And 2. *becauſe he had told us from S.* Auguſtin, *that it was their Office to inform the ſuperior Gods of what they could not know otherwiſe*; this is the only ground of this rude imputation of falſehood and contradiction to the Doctor: and yet this ground is as ridiculouſly vain as if I ſhould affirm this Propoſition to be falſe; that all the Heathens attributed to their good Spirits was only Interceſſion, becauſe they attributed to them Wings, and an Ætherial body: who is ſo blind as not to ſee, that when the Doctor ſaith *they made them*

* Quem invenirem qui me reconciliaret tibi, an eundum mihi fuit ad Angelos? qua prece? Quibus Sacramentis? multi conantes ad te redire neque per ſeipſos valentes, ſicut audio, tentaverunt hæc, & inciderunt in deſiderium curioſarum viſionum & digni habiti ſunt illuſionibus. Conſeſſ. l. 10. c. 42.

de C. D. l. 9. c. 23. p. 154.

p. 375, 376.

them Mediators of Interceſſion only, not Mediators of Redemption? by that excluſive *only* he could not intend to ſay that they aſſerted nothing elſe concerning them, as he moſt groſly doth miſtake, or moſt unconſcionably doth interpret him: but only that they aſcribed nothing to them which made them *Mediators of Redemption.* Moreover, is it fair dealing when he thus rails againſt *Dr. Stillingfleet* to do himſelf what he imputes unto the Doctor and quote him falſely in that very place, which yet he manifeſtly doth in ſetting down this paſſage as the Doctors words, *viz. that the giving them Divine Worſhip proceedeth upon that ſuperſtition*, &c. For both to this citation and to many paſſages pretendedly tranſlated from the Fathers, or cited as the ſenſe and meaning of their words, he adds this word *Divine* where it is not expreſſed; or in the leaſt intended, only that he may ſeem to anſwer when he doth nothing leſs; which is a fraud ſo horrible and diſingenious that no man can ſufficiently deteſt it, or judge that man can make a conſcience of his actions, who makes a common practice of it. 2. Let any man peruſe S. *Auguſtin*'s whole diſcourſe upon this matter, and he will find that to overthrow this Tenet of * *Apuleius*, and all Philoſophers that were of the ſame judgement with him, and held that their good Dœmons did ſo mediate betwixt the Gods and men, *as that they carried our petitions up to*

* Sed quia eoſdem Dæmones inter homines & Deos ita medios conſtitutos putant, tanquam nullus deus homini miſceatur, ut hinc perferant deſiderata, inde referant impetrata: atque hoc Platonici precipui Philoſophorum ac nobiliſſimi ſentiant, cum quibus, velut cum excellentioribus placuit iſtam examinare quæſtionem, utrum cultus plurimorum Deorum profit ad conſequendam vitam beatam, quæ poſt mortem futura eſt. De Civitat. Dei. l. 9. c. 1. p. 268. D.

them

them, and did return the Aids and Bleſſings of the Gods to us. He undertakes the Refutation of this *Platonick Doctrine*, and the examination of this Queſtion, whether the worſhip of thoſe many Gods or Dæmons was profitable to the obtaining of our future Bliſs; and to confute this Doctrine of the *Platoniſts*, and to prove this Mediation not to be profitable to this end, he argues thus; * *This Mediation cannot be performed but by a middle perſon, who partakes of ſome what that makes him like unto both parties: and therefore cannot be performed by good Angels, ſuch as the* Platoniſt *aſſerts theſe Dæmons are, becauſe Good Angels have happineſs and immortality with God, but neither miſery nor mortality by which they may agree with Man.* This is his argument even in that place, whence Dr. *Stillingfleet* doth cite theſe words, that *thoſe who are Chriſtians do believe, that we need not many, but one Mediator, and that ſuch a one, by whoſe participation we are made happy*, i. e. *the word of God not made, but by whom all things were made.*

* Proinde mediatorem inter nos & Deum & mortalitatem habere oportuit tranſeuntem, & beatudinem permanentem: ut per id quod tranſit, congrueret morituris, & ad id quod permanet transferret ex mortuis. Boni igitur Angeli inter miſeros mortales & beatos immortales medii eſſe non poſſunt quia ipſi quoque & beati & immortales ſunt. Id. ib. c. 15. vid. etiam c. 13.---Multi ſunt medii Separatores---ne poſſit ad illud unum beatificum perveniri, ad quod, ut perduceremur, non multis, ſed uno Mediatore opus erat, & hoc eo ipſo cujus participatione ſumus beati, hoc eſt Verbo Dei non facto, ſed per quod facta ſunt omnia. Ib. c. 15. A.

Now here the Doctor is with great confidence, and with as little reaſon accuſed of falſe p. 373.
tranſlation, and addition to St. *Auſtins* words; of addition, becauſe he ſaith, *thoſe that are Chriſtians do believe*: Of falſe Tranſlation in thoſe

thoſe words, *we need not many but one Mediator:* but it is eaſie to vindicate the Doctor from theſe falſe aſperſions; for, that Chriſtians only could be brought to the Enjoyment of God, was certainly St. *Auſtins* Faith, ſo then *ut perduceremur (ſc. nos ad Deum) non multis, ſed uno Mediatore opus erat, (ſc. nobis)* muſt import thus much, *That we Chriſtians may be brought to God, we have no need of many Mediators.* To cavil at this Tranſlation is to expoſe his ignorance to every School Boy: But to the Teſtimony of St. *Auſtin*, he returns this Anſwer, that *it is plain*
p. 374. *he ſpeaks of ſuch a Mediator, by whoſe participation we are made happy*, that is, *a Mediator of Redemption, and not a Mediator of Interceſſion*, Rep. it is as plain that St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of ſuch a Mediator, *who is the word of God, not made but making all things*, and that the *Platoniſt* acknowledged his Mediating *Demons, to be made by God*; the *Platoniſt* may therefore with *T. G.* infer, that it is plain he ſpeaketh not againſt them, though he deſigned nothing elſe, becauſe he ſpeaks of ſuch a Mediator by whoſe participation we are made happy; that is, (ſayth he) the word of God not made, *&c.* 2. Doth not St. *Auſtin* tell us in the begining of this Book, that ſeeing ſome Philoſophers affirmed, that their Good *Demons* were Miniſters to intercede with God, or carry up our Prayers to him, and to bring back his Bleſſings unto us, therefore he would enter upon this diſpute, *whether the worſhip of thoſe many Gods was profitable to Salvation.* And therefore it is evident he ſtood obliged to ſhew they did not contribute to our Salvation, by being Mediators of *Interceſſion* for us, as well as to exclude them from from being *Mediators* of *Redemption.*

The

The Works of *Origen* againſt *Celſus*, are ſo expreſs and clear againſt this practice of the *Church* of *Rome*, that if he had deſigned to confute the Doctrine of that Church, he could not have deviſed expreſſions more repugnant to it: for having confeſſed that * *holy Angels did carry up our Prayers to God, and bring down bleſſings from God to us*, (as he had learned in the School of *Plato*) leaſt any ſhould be tempted to infer from this, that we ſhould pray unto theſe Angels, or that it was uſeful or needful ſo to do, that ſo theſe Bleſſed ſpirits might be more propicious or helpful to us; he doth expreſly ſay, that * *to invoke them is no reaſonable thing*, and this aſſertion he confirms by many arguments. 1. *It is abſurd* (ſaith he) *to call upon them, becauſe we want the knowledge of their nature, and becauſe it is above the reach of Man.* And 2. *That if we could attain unto this Knowledge, that very Knowledge which declares their Nature and their Office to us, would not permit us to pray to any other, but unto God the Lord of all, who is abundantly ſufficient for all, by the Son of God.* 3. He reckons up in the Apoſtles language, all the kinds and ſorts of Prayer, (*a*) *Petition, Deprecation, Interceſſion*, and *Thanksgiving*: And then he adds, *all theſe we muſt put up to God by that high Prieſt, who doth Tranſcend all Angels*; and that this worſhip in any of the kinds forementioned, was therefore not to be conferred upon the An-

§ 2.

* ἀναβαίνειν ὠὴ τὰς εὐχὰς τοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐντεύξεις. p. 233.

(*a*) Ἀγγέλες μὲν καλέσαι μὴ ἀναλαβόντα· τὴν ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπες περὶ αὐτῶν δέησιν ἀπενέγκειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐυχῶν. ἵνα δὲ καὶ καθ' ὑπόδεσιν ἡ περὶ αὐτῶν δέησις ᾖ, θαυμάσιόν τις ἂν καὶ ἀπερίεργον, καταληφθεῖν. αὐτὴ ἡ ὑπόθεσις, παρεσκεύασε τὴν φύσιν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐφ' οἷς εἰσὶν ἔχασι πεπαιδεύκε, ἃ ἐάσει ἄλλῳ δωρεῖν ἔυχεσθαι ἢ τῷ περὶ πάντα δισρκεῖ τῷ διὰ τὸν Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν υἱὸν Θεόν. Orig. contra Celſum l. 5. p 233.

gels,

Ibid. gels, because they were not to receive (*b*) *the worship due to God.* 4. He adds, that *it was sufficient to obtain the favour of the holy Angels, and the assistance of their Prayers, to labour to have God propitious, and to procure his good will by godliness and vertue, and by imitation of the Angels Piety.* And therefore not only in his an-

Lib. 5. p. 233. swer to this objection, but elsewhere he tells us, *me must endeavor to approve our selves to him, who is one God over all, and we must pray to him for mercy, and that if* Celsus *will yet have us to procure the good will of others after him, who is God over all, he must consider, that as when the body is moved, the motion of the shadow thereof doth follow: so in like manner, having God favourable unto us who is over all, it followeth, that we shall have all his Friends, both Angels, and Souls, and Spirits loving unto us: For they have a fellow feeling with them that are thought worthy to find favour from God. To whom they are not only favourable, but they pray with them. So as we may be bold to say, that when Men which with resolution propose unto themselves the best things, do pray unto God: many thousand of the sacred powers pray together with them unspoken to.* Moreover when Celsus affirmed, that *thanks were to be given to Dæ-*

Id. l. 8. p. 420. *mons, and that our Prayers and first Fruits were to be offered to them; that so we might obtain their presence with us, and their favour to us, who have obtained of God to be Dispensers of inferiour things:* to this it is replyed by *Origen.* 1. *That God had given no such Government to Dæmons.* * 2. *That*

* Δαίμοσι τοῖς τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἰληχόσιν εὐχαριστήτεον, καὶ ἀπαρχὰς καὶ εὐχὰς ἀποδοτέον, ἕως ἂν ζῶμεν, ὡς ἂν φιλανθρώπων αὐτῶν τυγχάνοιμεν. l. 8. p. 396.

* Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπαρχὰς Κέλσος μὲν δαιμονίοις ἀνατιθέναι βούλεται· ἡμεῖς δὲ τῷ εἰ πόντι βλαστησάτω ἡ γῆ βοτάνην χόρτου, &c. ὧν δὲ τὰς ἀπαρχὰς ἀποδίδωμεν, τούτῳ καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς ἀπέμπομεν. Id. ib. p. 400.

first

firſt Fruits muſt be offered to God alone, who ſaid, let the Earth bring forth Fruit, and to him to whom the Chriſtians offered their firſt Fruits, they offered alſo their petitions. 3. He doth acknowledge that office which *Celſus* had aſcribed to wicked *Damons* did agree to *Angels*, who upon that account in Scripture were ſtiled *miniſtring ſpirits*, and do encamp about Gods ſervants for their protection and deliverance. But leaſt we ſhould infer with *Celſus*, that we muſt therefore pray unto them, to be thus propicious; he adds, we ſhall ſufficiently obtain their favour, by imitation of their Piety, and Invocation of that God to whom they pray. For thus he ſpeaks; *If we have a deſire to a multitude, whom we would willingly have to be favourable unto us, we learn that thouſand thouſands ſtand by him, and Millions of Millions miniſter unto him, who beholding them that imitate their Piety towards God, as if they were their Kinsfolkes and Friends, help forward their Salvation and call upon God, and pray ſincerely, appearing alſo, and thinking that they ought to do ſervice to them; and as it were upon one watch-word to ſet forth for the benefit and ſalvation of them that pray to God, unto whom they themſelves alſo pray.* l. 8. p. 400.

Now to all theſe and all the Arguments that any man can bring, *T. G.* returns this Anſwer, *viz.* "That Prayer implies either a total "dependance upon God as the Author of all "good, and ſo we ought to pray to God alone, "or an addreſs unto the Members of the "Church triumphant, for the aſſiſtance of their "Prayers to him, who only can give what "we ask, and in this ſenſe it is ſtill uſed by Ro"man Catholicks, when it is applied to Saints "and Angels; when therefore *Origen* denies § 32 p. 360

"that our Prayers are to be offered to any but "to Christ alone, he speaks of Prayer in the first "sense. This is that *Catholick answer*, which upon all occasion he produceth. This *Origen* and all the *Fathers* mean, verily it is this, and nothing else; Not that the Fathers of the four first Centuries, when they so roundly and frequently assert, that Prayer is to be offered unto God alone, did ever thus distinguish or speak one title of this nature, no, simple Creatures as they were: they absolutely, and without all distinction condemned what they daily practised, and practised what they had condemned; they all spake what was absolutely false, and meant only what was true; so that no Man could have imagined this to have been their meaning, had not *T. G.* been their Interpreter. Thus when *Origen* expresly saith, * *It is no reasonable thing to pray unto the Angels*, † *we must only pray to God and to his Son Christ Jesus.* He must affirm, what was a plain and absolute contradiction to the Churches Doctrine, but then his meaning must be Orthodox, and contradictory to what he doth assert. When he adds almost by way of Syllogism, *to whom we Christians offer our first Fruits: to him we offer up our Prayers:* But *to God alone we offer up our first Fruits*, *Ergo* to him alone we offer up our Prayers. When he informs us, that the *Christians were such as did not pray to Angels*, but *undividedly* and *inseparably did worship God by Jesus Christ*, *and came to God by Christ alone*, and *so, as to transcend even those blessed spirits*, *which are called Gods*, He must apparently bely the Christian World, according to the plain Interpretation of his words, but his intentions must be Orthodox. And yet 3. he doth not only deny

* Εἶτ' ἐπιλαθόμενος ὅτι χρεισιανοῖς λαλεῖ τοῖς μόνῳ τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ εὐχομένοις l. 8. p. 402.

† l. 5. p. 258.

l. 8. p. 382.

deny the Doctrine, and the practice of the Church of *Rome* to be the Doctrine and practice of the time wherein he lived, but he deſtroys the very ground and reaſon of that practice, *viz.* the benefit we may receive by putting up requeſts unto them; and the concernments which ly upon us ſo to do in order to our preſervation from all evil, and the obtainment of the greateſt bleſſings, for he expreſly tels us *our care muſt be to get his favour who alone is God*: and that if *Celſus* (or the Church of *Rome*) would have us to procure the favor of the inferior beings he muſt know that all good Spirits, Souls and Angels, (if we do obtain Gods favor, when we pray to him) they need not be called upon for the aſſiſtance of their prayers for they will pray together with us, (ἀκλητοι) not being called upon ſo to do. This he doth frequently repeat, and indeed it is the common language of thoſe times he lived in, witneſs the like expreſſion of *Arnobius*, * *In worſhiping the Father and the Lord of all things we worſhip all things that are to be worſhiped, we*

* In hoc omne, quod colendum eſt colimus: quod adorari convenit adoramus: quod obſequium Venerationis expoſcit Venerationibus promeremur. Cum enim divinitatis ipſius teneamus caput, à quo ipſa Divinitas divorum omnium, quicunque ſunt, ducitur, ſupervacuum putamus perſonas ire per ſingulas: cum & ipſi qui ſint, & quæ habeant nomina neſciamus: & cujus ſint præterea numeri, neque liquidum neque comprehenſum, neque exploratum habere poſſimus. Atque ut in terreſtribus Regnis neceſſitate nulla compellimur, regalibus in familiis conſtitutos nominatim cum Principibus adorare, ſed in Regum ipſorum cultu, quicquid illis annexum eſt, tacita & ſe ſentit honorificentia comprehendi: Non alia ratione qsicunqne hi Dii ſunt, quos eſſe nobis proponitis: ſi ſint progenies Regia, & principali oriuntur è capite, etiam ſi nullos accipiant nominatim à nobis cultus, intelligunt ſe tamen honorari communiter cum ſuo Rege, atque in illius venerationibus contineri. Arnobius contra Gentes, lib. 3 p. 101.

adore all things that may conveniently be adored, we venerate all that calls for veneration. For holding to the head from whence these Divi borrow their Divinity, we think it needless to go to every Person; seeing wee know not what they are, what names they have, or of what order they may be. And as in honoring the King wee honor all that do belong unto him, so what ever Gods you do propose unto us, if they be of this Kingly progeny, and do belong unto this head, although they do receive no worship from us they understand that they are worshiped together with their King, and are included in that veneration, which we pay to him.

4. This Answer renders the discourse of *Origen* impertinent, and a perfect declination of the Question betwixt him and *Celsus*: For *Celsus* thus disputes, *no God nor any Son of God can possibly descend from Heaven; but if you do assert this of the Angels of God these are no other than our Dæmons.* To this St. *Origen* returns this Answer. 1. That to deny that any God descends from Heaven, is to deny what was esteemed a thing common by the *Heathen World.* 2. That Christians do indeed confess this is the office of the Angels to come down from and to ascend to Heaven, and to offer up the Prayers of men to God, *but yet*, saith he, *we must not worship them as God, for all our Prayers must be directed to God, and to his Son Christ Jesus who is the living Word* and *God.* Which argument if it have any strength at all consists in this, *that which you must not worship and adore as God you must not pray unto, but Angels you must not worship and adore as God.* Ergo, *Angels you must not pray unto.* This is that Fathers plea to which *T. G.* may answer in behalf of *Celsus* as well as of the Church of *Rome*, that he apparently distinguisheth

Orig. l. 5. p. 232.

ſtinguiſheth thoſe Angels both from God and from the Son of God, and therefore did not contend that we ſhould pray unto them as to that God, who is the Author of all good, but only as to the Miniſters and Servants of God, whom he appointed to preſide over ſuch perſons, Families, and Countries. And therefore he was contented only that it might be lawful to ſay unto them as doth the Church of *Rome* to St. *Sebaſtian*, Cerne familiam tuam *(id eſt) behold thy family*: and to St. *Gabriel*, *preſerve thy Countrey*. 2. * *Celſus* objects that if with God we do adore his Son, then may we (καὶ τοῦ ὑπηρέτας αὐτοῦ θεραπεύεσθαι) venerate his Miniſters.

* Ἐκ τῶν θρησκεύειν ἡμᾶς μὴ τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ὑπὲρ ἅπαντα καὶ τοῦ ὑπηρέτας αὐτοῦ θεραπεύειν [ἡμῖν] τὸ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐ μόνον † Θεὸν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ ὑπηρέτας αὐτοῦ θεραπεύειν.

To this St. *Origen* replies; that if † *Celſus by the Miniſters of God had underſtood* Gabriel *and* Michael *and other Angels and Archangels and had contended that they ſhould be venerated, perpaps by purifying of the word, and of the actions of the venerators, we might ſay ſomething of that matter (i. e.)* Perhaps ſome actions which in ſome ſenſe may bear the name of veneration might be performed to thoſe Angels.

† Εἰ μὲν ἐν εἰδέναι τοὺ ἀληθῶς ὑπηρέτας † Θεοῦ μὴ † μονογενῆ † Θεὸν, † Γαβριὴλ καὶ τὸν Μιχαὴλ, καὶ τοὺ λοιπὺς ἀγγέλους, ἀρχαγγέλους, καὶ τίνας ἄλλους δεῖν θεραπεύειν αὐτῶν σημαινόμενον ἐκκαθάραντες, καὶ † τὸν † θεσπεσιώτατον λόγον † περὶ ἕξεων, εἴποιμεν ἂν εἶναί † τόπον, ὡς περὶ τηλικούτων ἀναλεγόμενοι, ἅπερ ἐχρῆμεν, περὶ αὐτῶν νοῆσαι. Orig. Contra Celſum, lib. 8. p. 386.

This *T. G.* thinks a great advantage to his cauſe; and *wonders that the Doctor would produce this paſſage.* But I conceive it is the cleareſt confutation of it, that we could deſire; For having

having granted this, and then reſtraining our petitions unto God the Father, and his Son Jeſus Chriſt, as he expreſly doth, he moſt apparently demonſtrates that prayer could be no part of the forementioned ſervice he allowed to Saints. 2. In that he thus diſtinguiſheth of veneration and never doth diſtinguiſh in the like manner of prayer and ſupplication, or of Δεησεις and προσκυνησις, *id eſt*, of adoration and worſhip: it follows that although he thought ſome veneration might be allowed to Angels in ſome inferior kind: yet no petition was to be put up unto them, and that no worſhip and adoration ſhould be given unto them. 3. When *Origen* in anſwer to this paſſage ſaith, * *we* (Chriſtians) *venerate with ſupplications only God and his Son Jeſus Chriſt, and put up our petitions to God by his only Son*: If he doth underſtand only ſuch ſupplications as are made to him as to the Author of all good, he is as vain and impertinent as *T. G.* in his Anſwers to the Dr. for *Celſus* only doth contend for ſuch a worſhip, and conſequently for ſuch addreſſes only as agree unto the *Miniſters* and *Servants* of God. 4. *Origen* plainly doth inform us that the veneration he allowed to Angels was † to ſpeak well of them and pronounce them bleſſed, and imitate to their virtues; and what is this to ſupplication? 3. *Celſus* objects that *Dæmons do belong to God and therefore muſt be prayed unto*: and a little after that, *to them it was given to preſide overthe Earth*, or to be patrons or Inſpectors of ſuch a City or of ſuch a Countrey; and upon that account infers we

* Τὸν ἕνα Θεὸν, καὶ τὸν ἕνα υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦς μὲν τὸ δυνατὸν ἡμῖν ἱκεσίαις, καὶ ἀξιώσεσι σέβομεν, προσαγορεύοντες τὸν Θεὸν περὶ ὅλων τὰς εὐχὰς διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ. Id. Ibid.

† Εὐφημοῦμεν αὐτοὺς καὶ μακαρίζομεν---- Id. l. 8. p. 416.

we muſt both pray and offer our thankſgiving and firſt fruits unto them. To all this *Origen* replies, that we muſt offer up our prayers to God alone, and we muſt pray to him alone to whom we offer our firſt fruits: in both which places if *Origen* intended only to affirm that prayer was due to God, which implies the object of our ſupplication to be the higheſt God and the chief Author of all Good, it is apparent he doth not in the leaſt deny what *Celſus* pleaded for, *viz.* ſuch ſupplication as he conceived due to ſuch *Dæmons* as were commiſſionated from God and belonged to him.

5. This Anſwer renders the diſcourſes of this learned Father ridiculouſly weak and unconcluding: as *v. g.* 1. We cannot rationally pray to Angels, ſaith this learned Father; *Becauſe we do not know their natures, nor are we capable of the knowledge of them.* Which if we underſtand it thus "We know not what their underſtanding "is, or whether they have any knowledge of "our hearts when preſent, or of our prayers "when abſent. And therefore do not conceive "it rational to pray unto them, it is both per- "tinent and concluſive: But if we underſtand "it thus, we muſt not pray unto them, as we "do to the great God of Heaven; becauſe we "do not know their Natures. Nothing is more abſurd and fooliſh, for certainly all Chriſtians knew ſo much of their nature as to believe they were not Gods. Beſides we neither know the nature of God nor are we capable of underſtanding it, and yet it will not follow that we we may not pray unto him, as to the Author of all Good. Again *it is abſurd*, ſaith he, *having God alwayes preſent with us to pray unto the Son which is not alwayes preſent*: now this abſurdi-

lib. 5. p. 233.

lib. 5. p. 239.

ty doth equally respect Prayer relative, and absolute; for if the Son can hear our prayers, and can obtain Gods blessings when he is not present, it cannot be absurd to pray unto him, because not present, but if he cannot, then must it be absurd to put up to him such petitions as the Church of *Rome* doth tender to the holy Angels. Moreover *we do not in the least contemne* (saith he) *so admirable a work of God, but yet we must not pray unto* (the Creature or) this work of God, *because it prayes for us:* Now here can any man conceive he should intend no more but this, you must not look on that as the supremest Deity, which I have told you is his Creature? No sure, had he and all the Christian World prayed daily to them, who do pray for us, he would have rather said you must not pray unto him, *as to that God who is the Author of all good, because he is a Creature.* 6. When *Origen* discourseth of this subject he usually saith that we must put up our petitions unto God by Christ, and having once confessed that we may pray directly to Christ whom he conceived to be inferior to the Father) he makes that very same distinction which our Author and his party do, *viz.* * That prayer may be taken properly καριολεξικῶς or κατακρηστικῶς *in an improper and abusive sense:* and in this sense alone he doth approve of prayer made to Christ, whereas had he allowed of any prayers made, to Saints and Angels, it is to be presumed having so many provocations and occasions to treat upon, and to explain the subject, he would have sometimes used this distinction, and would not alwayes have

lib. 5. p. 238.

* Δεησόμεθα δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου, καὶ ἐντευξόμεθα αὐτῷ, καὶ εὐχαριστήσομεν, καὶ προσευξόμεθα δὲ, ἐὰν δυνώμεθα κατακούειν τῆς περὶ προσευχῆς κυριολεξίας καὶ καταχρήσεως. l. 5. p. 233.

have denied this practice and condemned that doctrine, without distinction or exception: elsewhere, he saith, *If any man be not sufficient, (viz.* to go directly to God) *let him go to the Son of God who is able to heal him.* Since then he never saith as doth the Church of *Rome* let him go to *Saints* and *Angels*, certain it is that he did not approve this practise: and this is yet more evident from his reply to *Celsus*, for when *Celsus* had objected that *according to the Doctrine of the Ægyptians every part of a man hath a particular Dæmon or Æthereal God, and every one of these being invocated heals the diseases of the parts proper to themselves. Why then may not the Christians justly invocate the favor both of them and others if they had rather be in health than sickness?* To this it is replied by *Origen*; 1. That *Celsus* by advising us to go to *Dæmons*, sufficiently declared his distrust of the *inseparable and undivided worship of the God of all, and did imagine that to Worship God alone and honor him, was not sufficient to preserve those that did so from diseases and the insidiations of evil spirits*; which is an evident conviction that he did not think the invocation of the Archangel *Gabriel*, *Michael*, *Raphael*, or of *Sebastian*, *Valentinus*, or any other *Roman Saint*, (which they of *Rome* do daily invocate for their protection from these evil spirits, and the diseases which they are subject to) was needful for that end: or that it could be practised without distrusting of the all-sufficient God. 2. He adds, *It is much better to commit our selves to God, the Lord of all things by Jesus Christ, and ask of him all help, and in particular the custody of the holy Angels who may deliver us from these terrestrial Dæmons.* where also it is manifest that he would have us ask the help

Orig. lib. 8. p. 416.

lib. 8. p. 417.

lib. 8. p. 418.

help and cuſtody of Angels, not from them, as is the manner of the Roman Church, but
Orig. ib. only from the God of Angels. 3. He affirms that health is to be ſought either *by means of the Phyſitian, which is the ordinary way, or by extraordinary means*, viz. *by piety towards God in our addreſſes to him*, by which expreſſion it is alſo manifeſt that he was ignorant of that way of ſeeking health, which had its riſe from after ages, and is ſo common in the Church of *Rome*, for otherwiſe, as it is excellently obſerved by the learned Doctor, he muſt have told
p. 150. him that Chriſtians were not to addreſs "themſelves to *Chnumen*, *Chnaachnumen*, *Cnat*, *Sicat*, "*Biu*, *Eru*, or any other Heathen *Dæmons* to "obtain theſe Bleſſings but unto *Raphael* and "*Appollonia*, *Sebaſtian* and *Roach*.

Unto the firſt and ſecond argument urged by the Doctor, and moſt apparently confounding the doctrine and common practice of the Roman Church; *T. G.* affords us not one word of anſwer; the evidence being too plain and pregnant to admit of a reply; but over the third remark he triumphs and undertakes to render it ridiculous to all ſober Readers by ſhewing two things. 1. The difference between the Doctrine and Practice of the *Ægyptians*, and that of the *Catholicks*. 2. The reaſonableneſs of the practice of making addreſſes to one particular Saint rather than another: But 1. were both theſe things as true as Goſpel, yet are they horribly impertinent to what the Doctor urged, *viz.* that *Origen* had he conceived the invocation of any holy Angels or of Saints departed proper to obtain deliverance from the diſeaſes of the body he would have mentioned their names, in oppoſition to the names of thoſe Ægyptian preſidents

dents or Dæmons, whom *Celſus* did adviſe us to invoke on that account, Which argument is more convincing, becauſe he doth oppoſe unto them the holy name of *Jeſus* as that which was invoked by all true Chriſtians to that end: Now unto this conſideration nothing is more impertinent and more ridiculouſly oppoſed than theſe two things: For what if the *Ægyptians* did conceive their *Gnat* and *Sicat* to be Gods, why ſhould not *Origen* reply, that, we expect aſſiſtance rather from our Saints and Angels, than your Gods? And if the practice of making ſuch addreſſes to particular Saints had been conceived ſo reaſonable by this learned Father, he had the greater reaſon upon ſo fair an opportunity to have made mention of theſe Saints. *T. G.* ſaw this and knew that if the Doctors Argument had been propounded thus he could have nothing to object againſt it: And therefore that he might be able to frame ſome colour of an Anſwer he makes the Doctor ſpeak as if he did affirm "there was no difference between the "Ægyptian Dæmons or Æthereal Gods, and p. 362. "the Saints deceaſed, but in the names: or "between the Ægyptians addreſſes to theſe De"vils, and thoſe of the Catholicks to the holy "Saints and Angels, but in the language; and "that there needed no more but to correct the "names as you would do faults in Printing; "*viz.* for *Chnumen* to read *Raphael*, for *Chnaach*"*numen*, *Apollonia*, for *Gnat Sebaſtian*, &c.

Whereas this affirmation is plainly inconſiſtent with the Doctors words, who introduceth one p. 150. of the Church of *Rome* affirming that the thing was rational which he ſaid, only they were out in their names: For inſtead of *Chnumen*, *Chnaachumen*, *Cnat*, *Sycat*, *Biu*, *Eru*, &c. they ſhould have

have choſen *Raphael* for traveling, and againſt diſeaſes; *Apollonia* againſt the tooth-ach. Now it is ſure no Roman Doctor ever taught the very *name* of *Raphael* and *Appollonia* would cure diſeaſes, but that the Souls or perſons called by thoſe names, could do it And, 2. No Romaniſt can be preſumed to confeſs, according to the principles of his profeſſion, that it was either rational to pray to evil Spirits, or to bare words and names: and therefore when he brings him in aſſerting that the thing was rational which *Celſus* ſaid, only the names were to be changed, he cannot be conceived to mean it otherwiſe than thus *it is rational we ſhould pray for health, provided that we do not do it to theſe evil Spirits which are called by the names of* Cnat *and* Sicat, *but to thoſe bleſſed Spirits which in our Lyturgies are called* Raphael, Apollonia, Sebaſtian *and* Roach. 2 Of theſe two things the ſecond, *viz.* the reaſonableneſs of this practice the Doctor was ſo far from mocking at or making it the ſubject of his mirth, as doth *Arnobius*, that it is barely mentioned by the Doctor without the leaſt reflection on it, ſo that unleſs to mention be to expoſe this practice to deriſion, the Doctor cannot without the greateſt falſhood be accuſed of it; and if it be ſo, this guilt falls heavy on *T. G.* who ſpends ſo many pages to juſtify what is expoſed if it be only mentioned: The difference he puts betwixt the Ægyptian Dæmons and his Saints and Angels is (1.) that *the Ægyptians believed their Dæmons to be Gods.* But this is either manifeſtly falſe, or elſe intended only to delude the Reader; for *Celſus* calls them γηΐγενεις δαίμονας Earthly Dæmons: and adds "that wiſe "men taught their power was limited, that they "could only heal mens bodyes and foretell future

T. G. p. 368, 362, 363. p. 363. apud Orig. l. 8. p. 417.

"ture things to private Men, and Cities, and "had the power to do ſuch things as did con- "cern the actions of Mortal Men; and there- "fore bids us to beware, leſt we be guilty of "exceſs in paying Homage to them, and ſo "forget that ſervice which we owe unto their "Betters. Whence it is evident, that *Celſus* did not ſpeak of them as Gods in the moſt famous ſenſe, as it imports the great Creator of the World; but in that ſenſe, in which St. *Auſtin* ſaith, *whether you call them Angels, Gods, or Dæmons, the difference is only in the name:* Hence in this very place, *Celſus* firſt calls them Dæmons, and then by way of Paraphraſe æthereal Gods. (2.) Saith he, *the Invocation which* Celſus *here contended for*, was *votiva illis ſacrificia reddere, to offer Sacrifice to them, (which is due to God alone) and that upon account, that they had power to heal the Diſeaſes of the parts proper to themſelves.* de C. D. l. 9. c. ult. Ibid.

Anſw. (1.) this is that diſingenious art of adding to the words of *Origen*, which *T. G.* is ſo unconſcionable guilty of. For doth *Celſus* ſay, that if we ſacrifice unto them they will heal us? No; he expreſly ſaith, *invocati ſanant*, they do it *being called upon*: doth he ſay, that what he called Invocation was a Sacrifice? No, Doth he move us to ſacrifice unto them becauſe they heal? No, but only doth infer, τι οὐκ ὠλύει τούτους δεξιοῦσθαι, *why may we not endeavor to procure their favour*, doth *Origen* reply, that though he mentioned Invocation, he intended Sacrifice? No, but only thus, *Celſus would have us to believe the Dæmons* καὶ θεραπεύειν ἀ τὰ *and pay them Reverence*, if *Celſus* did contend for *ſacrificia votiva*, *Origen* anſwered not one word, to that which he contended for. Did the Ægyptian p. 416.

Magi

Magi procure theſe bleſſings from them by Sacrifice? No, *Origen* tells us, Ἀιγυπτίων μάγοι καλοῦντες that *the Ægyptian Magitians did this by*
p. 417. *Invocation of their Dæmons*, did he imagine that *Celſus* ſo conceived? No, he expreſly ſaith, that he had given us a Catalogue of *Ægyptian* Names ὡς καλούμενοι καὶ ἰώμενοι τὰ τῶν μερῶν πάθηματα,
Ibid. *which being called upon, healed the diſtempers of their parts.* Hath then *T. G.* no colour for this Interpretation? Anſw. For ſaying, that by Invocation *Celſus* intended *votiva ſacrificia*, he hath no pretence. For mentioning *votiva ſacrificia* he hath only this, *viz.* that *Celſus* before he came to mention the *Ægyptian Dæmons*, ſpeaking of other *Dæmons*, he contends ὡς ἰλεων ἡμᾶς αὐτοῖς
p. 415, 416. χαριστήρια *that Sacrifices of thanksgiving muſt be due unto them*; which *T. G.* very fairly turns into *votiva ſacrificia*, or *petitory ſacrifices*, that ſo he might have ſomething to pretend by way of Anſwer, though it be contradictory to *Origen* and *Celſus*, and to the practice of thoſe *Ægyptians* he mentions.

Object. *Origen acknowledgeth, that the Angels do of-*
P. 361. § 4. *fer up the prayers of Men to God: and ſurely it can never be Idolatry to deſire them to do what they do:* Anſw. The Miniſter prays for his Pariſh, and yet ſhould every Pariſhioner in his private Cloſet deſire him to pray for them, ſhould they put up mental prayers unto him, and ſo aſcribe unto him the knowledge of the heart, and of the deſires of Men abſent from him, they would make an Idol of him. Thus albeit the Angels are preſent in the aſſemblies of Saints, and offer up the prayers they hear, yet to invoke them when abſent, and with mental prayer, may duly be eſteemed Idolatry.

2. *T. G.*

2. *T. G.* informs us, that *Origen* in his first *Homily* upon *Ezekiel*, invocates an *Angel* in these words, * *Come holy Angel and receive him who is converted from his former Sins. Answer.* Ibid. * Veni Angele ſuſcipe ſermone converſum ab errore priſtino, a doctrina Dæmoniorum, ab iniquitate in altum loquente, & ſuſcipiens eum quaſi Medicus bonus confove, atque inſtitue, parvulus eſt, hodie naſcitur ſenex repueraſcens, & ſuſcipe tribuens ei baptiſmum ſecundæ regenerationis. f. 133, E.

1. We have juſt reaſon to ſuſpect this place is an addition to the works of *Origen*, 1. Becauſe it contradicts his conſtant plain opinion delivered ſo often, and ſo induſtriouſly confirmed in his reply to *Celſus*, it alſo contradicts the practice of the Church then being, (as *Origen* himſelf declares.

2. He ſpeaks thus to the Angel, *Receive him, and confer upon him the Baptiſme of the ſecond regeneration.* Now who ever heard of any Baptized by an Angel, who ever heard ſo uncouth and abſurd a Phraſe as is the *Baptiſme of ſecond Regeneration*? theſe therefore cannot be the words of Learned *Origen*, as all that know him muſt confeſs. Beſides, this ſpeech can be applied to none but *Origen* himſelf, and if it hath any ſenſe, it ſeemeth plainly to refer to his repentance after his lapſe into Idolatry, which haply is ſtiled *the Baptiſm of a ſecond Regeneration*, ſince then that ſtory is confuted by *Baronius*, it follows, that this paſſage which refers unto it, muſt be alſo falſe. A.d. 153. s. 121, 122, 123.

3. Were it granted that thoſe are the true words of *Origen*, they contain only an *Apoſtrophe*, ſuch as is that of *Auſtin* to St. *Chryſoſtome*, enter St. *John*, ſit with thy Brethren and others mentioned, *c.* 9. Or (2.) If I ſhould grant them

them to contain a formal Prayer, it is directed only to an *Angel* whom he conceived to be present, and it is only a *vocal prayer*, (for *Origen* conceived not only that every person, but also every Church had a * particular Angel that presided over it, and so was present there:) And therefore this Example is not pertinent to prove what we deny, *viz.* that it is lawful to pray unto them, when we have no assurance of their presence, or with *mental prayer*.

* Ego non ambigo & in cœtu nostro adesse Angelos non solum Generaliter omni Ecclesiæ sed etiam sigillatim. Hom. 23. in luc.

THE

THE CONCLUSION

Sheweth 1. *That what* T. G. *alleadgeth to prove the* Dr. *Guilty of falſe and diſingenious Citations, is moſt unconſcionably falſe.* 2. *That* T. G. *is notoriouſly Guilty of falſe and diſingenious citations.* 3. *That he very falſly repreſents the queſtion touching the Invocation of the Saints departed.* 4. *That* T. G. *is a Man of Wit; but in his Book, he hath not in the leaſt diſcovered himſelf to be a Man of Learning or of Judgment, but given us juſt reaſon to ſuſpect his want of both.*

WE are informed by the incomparable *Dalle*, that it was a Theſis publickly propoſed and defended by the *College* of *Lovain*, *that it is no mortal ſin to elude a great Authority, that is detracting from, or noxious to us with a Lye*; and that the *Janſeniſts* do frequently object againſt the Jeſuits, the ſame ungodly Tenet. That this hath been the conſtant practice of *T. G.* and that he owes the glory of his Book to his exact Conformity, to this acurſed Doctrine, I have demonſtrated already from many inſtances ſo clear, that nothing can admit of greater

§ 1. De uſu Patrum Cap. 3. P. 43.

ter evidence. Before I enter into a farther demonſtration of this Charge, I muſt aſſure the Chriſtian Reader, that from my heart I wiſh, that I had nothing of this nature to object againſt *T.G.* and I do think my ſelf unhappy that I have to deal with one, who by ſo baſe a proſtitution of his Conſcience, doth ſeek advantage to his cauſe. Indeed the ſubject is ſo unpleaſant and unwelcome to me, that I would certainly have wholly waved it, had not my Duty to my Brother, and the diſadvantage which the truth might ſuffer from theſe Arts, obliged me to proceed in this diſcovery, which both in pity to my ſelf, and to my Adverſary, I ſhall confine to the conſideration of what he hath delivered Part the Third, that ſo my Labour and his Guilt may be the leſs. This being thus premiſed, the Truth of what I charge him with, ſhall be made good. (1.) By conſideration of what he offers to crack the credit of the Dr. and caſt a Diſrepute on his incomparable Labors. And (2.) From divers inſtances of his endeavors by the forementioned Arts, to weaken the Authorities produced againſt him. And

§. 2. Firſt, the Dr. is very often (but moſt unjuſtly) charged with falſe Citations, Interpretations, and ſuggeſtions, touching the Authors cited by him, v. g. *The Dr.* ſaith he, *makes a terrible blunder by his dextrous Tranſlating*, &c. p. 371. And again p. 373. *The Dr.* ſaith he, *firſt makes a Preface of his own, as if it was* St. Auſtins, *and then turns* opus erat, *there was no need, into we need not*, &c. And p. 375. he makes the Dr. to *avouch in the face of the World* 156. what was a perfect contradiction to what he told us out of St. *Auſtin* p. 155. and out of *Celſus* p. 150. Theſe imputations I have already

dy proved to be falſe and groundleſs in their reſpective places; whither I refer the Reader. v. Ch. 9. § 3.

Again, the Dr. having given us the deſcant of *Theodoret*, upon that paſſage of St. *Paul*, and upon that Canon of *Laodicea*, which forbids Chriſtians to Worſhip Angels, he ſubjoyns theſe words, *No wonder that* Baronius *is ſo much diſpleaſed with* Theodoret, *for this Interpretation*; p. 155. *for he very fairly tells* what he condemns (and St. *Paul* too) *was the practice of their Church, and thoſe Oratories were ſet up by Catholicks, and not by Hereticks.* This is foul dealing ſaith *T. G.* and *theſe are pitiful ſlights of Sophiſtry, to delude an unwary Reader: And he ſhall wonder if the* p. 380. Dr. *find any one that will believe him*, ſo that p. 383. what Dr. *Stillingfleet* hath here delivered, muſt be incredible foul dealing, or elſe *T. G.* muſt certainly be guilty of much diſingenuity and falſhood in this accuſation, which runs thus, *viz. That the* Dr. *ſaith that* Baronius *very fairly tells us, that not only what* Theodoret *condemned, but what* St. *Paul too* condemned, *was the practice of the Church of* Rome. p. 383. Anſw. Theſe words *Baronius fairly tells us* (*ſaith the* Dr.) that *what* St. *Paul condemned was the practice of the Church*, are a malicious untruth, the Dr. having taken all the care imaginable, to prevent this miſtake in all judicious Readers, for this expreſſion (and St. *Paul* too) which is the only ground of this rude charge, he did not only put in a Parentheſis, but in a different Character, that ſo no Reader might have the leaſt appearance of colour for ſo falſe an imputation. This *T. G.* ſaw, as is apparent from the words cited by him, p. 380. And therefore when he comes to lay his accuſation (p. 383. Sect. 3.) he very craftily ſets down the Doctors

words without Parentheſis, or any difference of the Character. This I am ſure is foul dealing, and theſe are pitiful arts of Sophiſtry. What therefore Dr. *Stillingfleet* aſſerts, is only that *Baronius* tells us, * *That what Theodoret condemns, and* in his judgment, *St.* Paul *too*, *was the Practice of the Roman Church*, than which nothing can be more true and certain, for having told us that *Theodoret* aſſerted, hæc a Paulo eſſe ſcripta, quod tum graſſarentur hæretici, qui Angelos colendos eſſe jactarent, or *that the admonition, beware leaſt any Man deceive you by worſhipping of Angels*, &c. *was written by St.* Paul, *by reaſon of ſome Hereticks, who taught that Angels ſhould be worſhipped, and that the* 35 *Canon of* Laodicea, *was directed againſt ſuch Hereticks as worſhipped Angels*, he adds, cæterum Angelos venerari, non hæreticorum, ſed Catholicæ Eccleſiæ mos fuit: *this he erroneouſly taught; but to worſhip Angels was not the Cuſtome of Hereticks, but of the Church Catholick.* And now let the diſcerning Reader judge what reaſon

p. 381. *T. G.* had to ſay, that *theſe are not* Baronius *his words, but the Doctors*; which is another of his Demonſtrations, that it is but too too evident, that the Dr. hath not dealt fairly with *Baronius*:

Ibid. But ſaith *T. G. theſe are not Baronius his words, but*

* Ex his videas (quod neceſſario dicendum eſt) Theodoretum haud feliciter, ejus pace ſit dictum, aſſecutum eſſe Pauli verborum ſenſum cum in hujus ad Coloſſenſes Epiſtolæ commentariis dicit hæc a Paulo eſſe ſcripta quod tum graſſarentur hæretici qui Angelos colendos eſſe jactarent — ſic ergo errore ſemel lapſus in alium Graviorem impegit, ut diceret Canonem trigeſſimum quintum Laodiceni concilii de his Hæreticis eſſe intelligendum qui Angelos colendos eſſe docerent quique in eadem regione Aſiæ oratoria erexiſſent Sancto Michaeli Archangelo, incautè nimis quæ a Catholicis eſſent antiquitus inſtituta, hæreticis quorum nulla eſſet memoria, tribuens. Annal. An. 60. § 20. cæterum Angelos venerari non Hæreticorum ſed Catholicæ Eccleſiæ mos fuit § 21.

but the Doctors, *for* Baronius *saith there expreſly, that* Theodoret, *as to the Doctrine of the veneration of Angels*, recta ſenſit, *that is, held the ſame which the Roman Church holds at this day.* To which I anſwer in his own expreſſions, *ſuch arts as theſe were enough to make a Man ſuſpect a good cauſe, much more to deſert a bad one*: for *Baronius* doth not abſolutely ſay, that *Theodoret* did *recta ſentire*, but makes a manifeſt exception as to this his Interpretation of St. *Paul* and the forementioned Canon, his words are theſe, * *Theſe things touching the true ſence of this Canon being thus cleared, the falſe Interpretation of* Theodoret *remains ſufficiently confuted, whereas otherwiſe, as to his Doctrine, it is not to be doubted, but he thought right of Angels*; which paſſage doth not only manifeſt the wretched fraudulency of *T. G.* but gives him an example of what he thought incredible: for if *Theodoret* could affirm the practice of the *Roman Church* was an heretical practice, and as ſuch condemned both by St. *Paul*, and by the Canon of the Univerſal Church, and yet hold the ſame with the *Roman Church*; why might not *Baronius* do the like; either *Theodoret* was a very great Dolt, or *Baronius* deals not fairly with him, which is but too too evident.

p. 145.

p. 380.

* His igitur de germano ſenſu illius Canonis Elucidatis, ſatis Theodoreti perperam facta interpretatio remanet refutata; cum Alioqui N. B. in his quæ ſpectant ad dogmata, non ſit dubium ipſum rectum ſenſiſſe de Angelis. Annal. An. 60. § 23.

2. *T. G.* concludes, that theſe are not *Baronius* his words; *becauſe the point in which* Baronius *differs from* Theodoret, *is not that thoſe were not condemned by him. And St.* Paul *too, who worſhipped Angels upon the Erroneous account aforeſaid*, viz. *That acceſs could only be made to God by Angels*: *But that* Theodoret *judged* Baroni-

p. 381.

"*us* miſtaken in aſſerting the Authors of that "Doctrine, not to have been the Heathen Phi-"loſophers, but certain Hereticks: *This is what* Baronius *ſaith.* Where firſt he cunningly (but falſly doth inſinuate) that in the judgment of *Theodoret*, St. *Paul* and the forementioned *Canon*, only condemneth them, who worſhipped Angels upon this erroneous account, *that acceſs could only be made to God by the Angels*: and if this be the grievous error, and that falſe
p. 379. interpretation, with which *Baronius* doth ſo ſmartly charge him, *T. G.* does very ill to eſpouſe it in his Interpretation of this Canon. But the truth is, *Theodoret* in the Expoſition of this paſſage of St. *Paul*, only affirms that this was the opinion of the *Hereticks*, but doth not in the leaſt inſinuate, that either the *Council*, or St. *Paul* condemned them only upon this account, but without all limitation or exception, he affirms that *they condemned praying to them.* (2.) What he ſays was not the point in which *Baronius* differs from *Theodoret*, is ſo apparently the point, though not the only point, that nothing can be more. For his great peak againſt him is, that he aſſerted, that both St. *Paul* and the forementioned Council condemned the Hereticks for teaching the Worſhip of Holy Angels; whereas ſaith he, *this was the very practice of the Church of Chriſt, and not of Hereticks.*

The Dr. tranſlates it equivocally to perform any ſacred offices. T.G. p. 386.

Another inſtance of the Doctors juggling tricks, *T. G.* produceth *p.* 386. *viz.* that when St. *Auſtin* had affirmed the bleſſed Spirits are not willing we ſhould *Sacra eis facere*, perform ſacred Offices to them, he tranſlates *Sacra facere* to perform ſacred Offices, as if he did imagine, ignorant perſon that he was, that *Sacra* ſignified

ſignified Sacred Offices, and *facere* to perform: Whereas *T. G.* informs him, that *Sacra facere* is *to Dedicate*, and becauſe this ridiculous interpretation would not help him out, for Papiſts dedicate their ſervice to the bleſſed Spirits; he adds that *it is evident*, St. Auſtin *ſpeaks of the worſhip which is due to God alone; that is, of ſuch dedications and conſecrations as were performed by the Heathens to their Dæmons as Gods*: And having *T. G's.* word for this, you ought not to expect his proof. But (1.) The words of St. *Auſtin* do apparently diſtinguiſh betwixt performing Sacred Offices and Conſecration of our ſelves unto them; for ſaith he, the Queſtion is * *Whether it can pleaſe thoſe holy Spirits that we ſhould perform Sacred offices and Sacrifices to them, or ſhould conſecrate our ſelves or any thing belonging to us by Religious Rites*: The affirmative is the opinion of the *Platoniſts* and of the Church of *Rome*, but that we ſhould not conſecrate our ſelves unto them by any Religious Rite is the opinion of S. *Auſtin*. (2.) St. *Auſtin* had in the immediate foregoing Chapter undertaken to evince † *that thoſe bleſſed ſpirits would not be worſhiped*, Sacris & Sacrificiis (*id eſt*,) *by Sacred Offices and Sacrifices*, but that God only was to be worſhiped by ſuch rites: and though he ſaith they would not be worſhiped *Deorum nomine*, which gave occaſion to this Anſwer of *T. G.*

* Quomodo Credendi ſint velle a nobis religionem pietatemque ſervari: hoc eſt, ut apertius dicam utrum etiam ſibi, an tantum Deo ſuo, qui etiam noſter eſt, placeat eis nos ipſos ut ſacra faciamus, Et Sacrificemus, vel aliqua noſtra, ſeu Religionis Ritibus conſecre mus.

† Quos autem bonos, & ideo non ſolum immortales verum etiam beatos Deorum nomine Sacris & Sacrificiis propter vitam beatam poſt mortem adipiſcendam colendos putant, qualeſcunque illi ſint, & quolibet vocabulo digni ſint, non eos velle per tale religionis obſequium niſi unum Deum coli, a quo creati, & cujus participatione beati ſint, adjuvante ipſo in ſequenti libro diligentius diſſeremus, de Civit. Dei, l. 9. c. 23.

St. *Auſtin* in this very Chapter doth inform us, that theſe *Platoniſts* againſt whom he diſputed did not differ from the Chriſtians in their apprehenſions of their Dæmons, and as if he had intended to exclude this expoſition of *T. G.* he adds that "*Platoniſts* acknowledged their "Dæmons to be good Spirits, made by God "and therefore only called them Gods, in ſuch "a ſence, in which the Scripture was wont to "Stile the Angels Gods: So that it is moſt certain (1.) that *Sacra facere* was not equivocally tranſlated to perform Sacred Offices. And (2.) that *Auſtin* doth not ſpeak of the worſhip due to God alone, but of the worſhip due to good Spirits, made by God.

De C D. lib. 9. c. 23.

§ 5. *Pag.* 390, 391. We have a freſh attempt to blaſt the Credit of the Doctor, but I have throughly conſidered it, *Chap.* 6. *Prop.* 4. *Corol.* 3. and have made it clear beyond all contradiction, that it is, only a rude heap of falſe ſuggeſtions, and diſingenious inſinuations: be pleaſed Reader to conſult the place, and disbelieve me if thou canſt.

§ 6. From *p.* 390, to 430. he is more ſparing in his accuſations; but from that Page to the concluſion of his book, we have but little beſides Prodigious outcries and admirations of the miſerable ſhifts, and diſingenious arts of *Dr. Stillingfleet*; and thus the Charge begins. "I muſt "deſire the Reader to take the pains to peruſe "attentively the words of S. *Auſtin*, as they ſtand "cited in the *Reply*, and the Doctors *conſidera-* "*tions* upon them (for himſelf thought not fit "to call them an *Anſwer*;) that by his perfor- "mance in this point, he may ſee to what "miſerable *ſhifts*, and diſingenious *arts they* "are put, who will *ſhut their Eyes*, and fight againſt

p. 431.

"againſt the *light* of a *Noon-day* truth. And then he proceeds to charge the Doctor with *corrupting the words of Auſtin*, and with an expoſition *not only oppoſit unto the ſence of* Auſtin, *but confuted by him*. And with affirming what *if he had not ſhut his Eyes could not have been affirmed*, and yet all this I have demonſtrated to be falſe, *Chap. 9. Sect. 11.* li. 22. li. 29. li. 16.

But then what follows (*p.* 432.) is that diſingenious accuſation which deſerves for ever to to be branded with a note of Infamy; *viz. Whereas he ſaith that I conveniently left out, what* St. Auſtin *adds, that not only Sacrifice was refuſed by Saints and Angels, but any other Religious honor, which is due to God himſelf; had he not conveniently put in thoſe words (any other Religious honor) into the Text, (for they are not in* S. Auſtin) *he had had nothing to blind his Reader with. Whoever looks into the Text will judge he had done much more conveniently for his Cauſe had he left it out. Anſw.* This he avoucheth here in the face of the world but as I ſuppoſe in confidence that neither his *Reader* or his *Adverſary* would be ſo rude as to look into the Text, or to ſuſpect the truth of what he doth aſſert with ſo much confidence: For thus St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks; *Cum autem ad hunc* Cultum *pertineat oblatio Sacrificii unde Idololatria dicitur eorum qui hoc etiam Idolis exhibent nullo modo* tale aliquid *offerimus*. Now let it only be obſerved that Sacrifice is on all hands confeſſed to be religious worſhip, and then let Romaniſts themſelves be judge, whether *nullo modo tale aliquid offerimus* do not ſignify *we do not offer ony other religious honor which is due to God himſelf*, and which would render us Idolaters? ſo unhappily did he adviſe us to peruſe attentively the words of *Auſtin*, which do ſo clearly evidence that it is not p. 432. p. 433. lib. 20. contra Fauſt. c 21.

the

the Doctor but *T. G.* who is forced to fly to *miſerable ſhifts*, and *diſingenious Arts*.

§ 7. The Doctor (*p.*173.) Speaks thus, "we do "not ſay, that ſome ſuperſtitions did not creep in "after the Anniverſary meetings at the Sepulchres "of the *Martyrs* grew in requeſt; for St. *Auſtin* "himſelf ſaith that *what they taught was one* "*thing, and what they did bear with was another*, "ſpeaking of the Cuſtoms uſed at thoſe Solem-"nities. Now here *T. G.* is pleaſed to repreſent him as a moſt unconſcionable Cheat, and with great wonderment Cryes out; "Is it poſſible
p. 439. "he could think ſo great a *forb* as this could "paſs for *current* in the World? Is it poſſible "he could have *courage* enough to cite the place, "where theſe words are to be found, and not "fear a *Rat*, Obſerve I pray. What St. *Auſtin* "condemns is this, that *ſome* who brought *Wine* "and *Meat* to the *Sepulchres* of the *Martyrs* took "ſo plentifully of them, that *they made them-*"*ſelves drunk*: His words are theſe, *as for thoſe* "*who make themſelves drunk at the Sepulchres of* "*the Martyrs*: how *can they be approved by us* "*whom ſound doctrine condemns, even when they do* "*it in their own private houſes.* This was the Cu-"ſtom of which S. *Auſtin* ſaith that the Governors "of the Church *did not teach it but bore with it till* "*it could be amended.* And the Doctor had the "*conſcience* by a ſubtle Inſinuation, to make his "Reader believe, that what S. *Auſtin* condemned, "was the *deſiring*, or, as he calls it, *wiſhing the* "*Martyrs to pray for them*, I ſhall leave him to "make *ſatisfaction* to *God* and the *World*. *Repl.* Here I am at a ſtand for I am loath to think that any Chriſtian ſhould with ſuch confidence and pertneſs accuſe his Brother (though he be an Adverſary) without the leaſt occaſion or reaſon

reaſon ſo to do. Conſcience and credit are ſo deeply intereſted in ſo foul a Charge, that I cannot imagin that it ſhould be laid by any perſon who values either of them, againſt one who is wholly innocent. I will not therefore ſay the Doctor is not Guilty, but will crave leave to tell the Reader what mine Eyes can wittneſs too. *viz.*

1. That what the Doctor doth affirm is *that* St. Auſtin *ſpeaking of the cuſtoms uſed at the Solemnityes of Martyrs, ſaith, that what they taught was one thing and what they did bear with was another.* Now what thoſe Cuſtoms were St. *Auſtin* and from him the Doctor tells us in this very Parapraph *viz.* * *Their banquetings at the Martyrs Tombs, and their worſhiping of Sepulchres and Pictures: viz.* the Pictures of thoſe Martyrs, which Image worſhip being relative, muſt certainly refer unto the worſhip of the martyrs by them; which cuſtom St. *Auſtin* had no ſooner mentioned but he cryes out, *Now I adviſe you* (Manicheans) *that you ceaſe to ſpeak evil of the Catholick Church by upbraiding it with the manners of thoſe whom ſhe her ſelf condemneth, and ſeeketh every day to correct as naughty Children*: when the Excellent *Voſſius* had alledged this place he preſently cryes out *See with what clearneſs* St. Auſtin *reprehends this growing Cuſtom.* p. 174.

* Novi multos eſſe Sepulchrorum & Picturarum Adoratores: novi multos eſſe qui luxurioſiſſimè ſuper mortuos bibant, & epulas Cadaveribus exhibentes ſuper ſepultos ſeipſos ſepeliant. Nunc vos illud admoneo, ut aliquando Eccleſiæ Catholicæ maledicere deſinatis vituperando mores hominum, quos & ipſa condemnat, & quos quotidie tanquam malos filios corrigere ſtudet. De moribus Eccleſ. Cath. lib. 1. cap. 34.

quam aperte irrepentem improbat conſuetudinem. Th. Theol. 206. Th. 12.

2. My Eyes can witneſs that what St. *Auſtin* doth refer to, not only in the place now cited and quoted by the learned Doctor, but in the paſ-

paſſage he excepts againſt, is not only the luxury of the intemperate, as *T. G.* ſuggeſts, but it is alſo error infirmorum *i. e. the error of the weak*; as *Auſtin* teſtifies. To make this farther evident let us conſider that the objection of the *Manichæans*, which St. *Auſtin* Anſwers in this place, was this: *viz.* * that the Cathocicks had converted the Chriſtian Martyrs into Idols, that they did drink and feaſt at their Sepulchres, and that they "worſhiped them "with like addreſſes, or by "preſenting of the like de-"ſires to them. To the ſecond part of this objection St. *Auſtin* largely Anſwers that it was true "they "gave to holy Martyrs the worſhip of ſociety "and love, but did not give to them that wor-"ſhip which was due to God. And then proceeding to the other part of the Objection, touching thoſe who at the feaſt of Martyrs did eat and drink unto exceſs, he tels us *that the Church condemns them*, and then immediately he adds, † *that it is one thing which we teach, another thing which we endure, it is one thing which we are enjoyned to commanded, but it is another thing which we are commanded to amend, and till we can do ſo, we are conſtrained to ſuffer: the diſcipline of Chriſtians is one thing, the luxury of Wine-bibbers, or the infirmity of the weak, another.*

* Hinc nobis calumniatur Fauſtus quod Martyrum memorias honoramus, in hoc dicens, nos Idola convertiſſe. l. 20. c. 21.

Vertiſſe dicit Idola in Martyres, quos votis, inquit ſimilibus colitis, Defunctorum umbras vino placatis & dapibus. Adverſ Fauſt. lib. 20. ibid.

† Qui autem ſe in memoriis Martyrum inebriant, quomodo à nobis approbari poſſunt, cum eos, etiam ſi in Domibus ſuis id faciant, Sacra Doctrina condemnet? Sed aliud eſt quod docemus, aliud quod ſuſtinemus: aliud quod præcipere jubemur, aliud quod emendare præcipimur; & donec emendemus, tolerare compellimur. Alia eſt diſciplina Chriſtianorum, alia luxuria vinolentorum, vel error infirmorum. Adverſ. Fauſtum lib. 20. cap. 21.

And

And now I leave it to the judgment of all ſober perſons, to conſider, whether the luxury of wine bibbers, was the only thing St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of here, and whether he doth not alſo ſpeak of the infirmity of ſuch as gave occaſion to that objection of the *Manicheans*, *ſimilibus votis eos colitis.*

3. Whereas he adds, the Dr. had the Con- p. 439.
"ſcience by a ſubtil inſinuation, to make his
"Reader believe, that what St. *Auſtin* condem-
"ned was the deſiring, or as he calls it, wiſhing
"the Martyrs to pray for them. Anſ. this is ano-
ther inſtance of *T. G*'s. Excellency in the Art of Calumny. For all that can be Rationally infer-red from the Doctors words, is only this, *that St.* Auſtin *did affirm, that ſuperſtitions at that time had creeped into the Church, and therefore this as well as others might do ſo.* But had the Dr. uſed this inſinuation, it would have been as true as it is counted ſubtil, for St. * *Auſtin* here affirms, *it is a leſs Sin to return Drunk from thoſe Solemnities, than to ſacrifice unto the Martyrs whilſt we continue to be Faſting; I ſay,* (quoth he) *to ſacrifice unto the Martyrs but I do not ſay to ſacrifice to God at the Memorial of Martyrs, which we often do, after the manner only, according to which God hath commanded us to Sacrifice under the Goſpel, which Sacrifice doth appertain unto* Latria, *and is due to God alone. Whence I thus argue.*

* Verumtamen & in hoc ipſo diſtant plurimum culpæ vinolentorum & Sacrilegorum. Longe quippe minoris peccati eſt, ebrium redire a Martyribus, quam vel jejunium ſacrificare Martyribus. Sacrificare Martyribus dixi, non dixi ſacrificare Deo in memoriis Martyrum, quod frequentiſſime facimus, illo duntaxat ritu, quo ſibi ſacrificari novi Teſtamenti manifeſtatione præcepit: quod pertinet ad illum cultum, qui latria dicitur, & uni Deo debetur. Ibid.

That

That which is a Goſpel Sacrifice ought not to be offered to a Creature; But prayer is a Goſpel Sacrifice; (for ſo St. † *Auſtin* doth often ſtile it in this very Book) *Ergo*, prayer ought not to be offered to a Creature; and now it is not eaſy to declare, whether the folly or the falſhood, the confidence or the weakneſs of this accuſation were the greater: but I am not willing to expoſe him farther in this matter, I pray God he may repent of this Iniquity, and make due ſatisfaction to God and the World, and Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and ſo I paſs on to ſome freſh diſcoveries of the ſame.

† Quas autem habere ſimplices & puras orationes tanquam divinos honores & ſacrificia poteritis? ubi ſunt ſacrificia veſtra ſimplices ac puræ orationes veſtræ? l. 20. contr. Fauſtum. c. 17.

§ 8. In his reply to the firſt Anſwer of the Dr. he affirms, that *Auſtin himſelf held formal Invocations a part of the Worſhip due to Saints.* This
p. 25. he confirms, firſt from that paſſage of St. *Auſtin*, *let bleſſed* Cyprian *help us with his Prayers*,
p. 26. and for a farther confirmation of it, *viz.* that *Auſtin* held this Invocation to be a part of Worſhip due to Saints. *We have*, ſaith he, *the ingenious confeſſion of* Calvin *himſelf*, Inſtit. lib. 3. Ch. 20. n. 22. *where ſpeaking of the Third Council of* Carthage, *in which* St. *Auſtin* was *preſent*, *he acknowledged it was the Cuſtom at that time to ſay*, *Holy* Mary, or *Holy* Peter *pray* for
p. 174. *us.* To this the Doctor anſwers thus, *I cannot but wonder*, *if he ſaw the words in Calvin*, *that he would produce them*; *for* Calvin *doth there ſay*, *that the Council of* Carthage *did forbid praying to Saints*, *leaſt the publick prayers ſhould be corrupted by ſuch kind of adreſſes*, *holy* Peter *pray for us: To this* T. G. replies, *have not I*
p. 444. *more reaſon to* wonder *at his* wonder, *for why*,

I

I pray, was such a Decree made, and why did the Fathers *of that* Council *fear, lest the* publick prayers *should be corrupted by* such kind *of addresses, if there were* no such Custome *at that time? either the Doctor* corrupts *the words of his dear* Master Calvin, *or, it is manifest, they* imply *it was the* Custome *at that time to say* Holy Peter pray for us. *Answ.* The Dr. doth confess that there was such a Custom, condemned by *Councils* and *Fathers*, as was that Custom of those times, of Banquetting at the Sepulchres of Martyrs, and that which is condemned by the same Council in these words, *It pleaseth us that the Altars which are commonly erected in the Fields and Roads, as the Memorials of the Martyrs, in which it is not evident, that the body or any reliques of the Martyrs are preserved, should be demolished by the Bishops, if that can be done, but, if the popular tumults will not suffer it, then let the people be admonished, that they do not frequent these places.* Can. 3. so that *T. G.* discourseth thus, that which was condemned by the Councils and Fathers was the Custom of those times, but direct prayer and invocation, was condemned by the Counsel and the Fathers, *Ergo* it was the Custom of those times: and if this be a good Argument, this Doctrine was condemned by the Church of Christ: *Ergo* this was the Custome of the Church of Christ: Then all the Heresies that ever were condemned by Councils and by Fathers, must be acknowledged to have been, the Customes of the Church of Christ. But *T. G.* will *set down* the words of *Calvin*, and make it thence appear that *there was such a Custom.* Answ. By all this what the Dr. doth confess, *viz. That some people condemned by the Council used this Custome*, shall appear, but

p. 445. but what *T. G.* had undertaken to make good from this Citation, *That St.* Auſtin *held, that formal Invocation, was a part of the worſhip due to Saints.* This ſhall diſappear. *But then again, who ſeeth not ſaith* T. G. that for fear the Reader ſhould ſee this; *the Dr. moſt conveniently left out of his Citation, thoſe words of* Calvin, *which were moſt material to the preſent purpoſe,* viz. *That the* Decree *was made, to forbid direct praying to Saints at the Altar, and the reaſon, in his opinion, why thoſe Fathers made that Decree, was to reſtrain the force of an evil Cuſtom, which they could not totally repreſs? for had theſe words been put down, the thing had been too clear to be denied, viz.* that Calvin acknowledged there was ſuch a Cuſtome at that time: where firſt the Dr is introduced as one denying that *Calvin* did acknowledge, that there was ſuch a Cuſtome at that time, whereas he manifeſtly
p. 174 confeſſeth what *T. G.* doth affirm, that he denies, for he expreſly ſaith from *Calvin, that the Council did condemn and forbid thoſe prayers, which were in uſe by ſome of the people,* Secondly, whereas he doth accuſe the Dr. for leaving out the words of *Calvin,* which were moſt material to the preſent purpoſe. This alſo is a loud untruth, as will appear by ſetting down the Doctors words, and by comparing of them with the words of *Calvin,* as they are repreſented in *T. G.* and they are theſe; *That the Council of* Carthage *did forbid praying to Saints, leſt the publick Prayers ſhould be corrupted by ſuch kind of Addreſſes, Holy* Peter, *pray for us.* And again, *the Council did condemn and forbid thoſe Prayers, which were in uſe by ſome of the People:* And now what is there in the words of *Calvin* Tranſlated by *T. G.* which is not contained in the

the words of Dr. *Stilling fleet.* These things I have collected, not that I take delight in the discovery of this unchristian spirit of Calumny. I can assure *T. G.* it is no small Grief to me to find a Dr. of Divinity, so prone to wound his Conscience, and expose his credit to the censure of discerning Men. I am afflicted that the Atheist should have such great Temptations, to suspect that we are guilty of the like insincerity, in managing of the Christian cause against him; or that the people should have such reason to cry out, behold the falshood of our Priests; see here what little reason we can have to credit any thing they say; since what they confidently avouch in the face of the World, is so unconscionably false and full of Calumny: But I intreat them to consider, we have great reason to suspect, tis the unhappy principles of the Roman party, which do betray them to this evil practice. They think it lawful to equivocate and lye to those they are pleased to call Hereticks, and to promote the Cause of Holy Church by such unchristian Arts. This I in charity believe, because I would not think them guilty of what this practice must import, if it were used by Protestants.

A second Art whereby *T. G.* endeavors to evade this charge, and bring a disrepute upon the Doctors Person and Performance, is a false and disingenious representation of the Question betwixt us and the Church of *Rome*, and an endeavour to possess the Reader with an apprehension that the Dr. waved it, and durst not speak unto it. Thus *p.* 334: *That the Reader may see what a* prodigious stock *of Wit is requisite to make it out, that Invocation of Saints is Idolatry, I will, saith he, set down the* Doctrine *of* § 9.

the Church, *as it ſtands Recorded in the* Council *of* Trent: *What that* Council *teacheth, is, that, it is good and profitable for Chriſtians humbly to Invocate the Saints, and to have recourſe to their prayers, aid, aſſiſtance whereby to obtain benefits of God, by his Son, our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour.* Theſe are the very words of the *Council*, and any Man *but* of *common reaſon*, would think it were as eaſy to prove *Snow* to be *black*, as ſo *innocent* a practice to be *Idolatry*, even *Heathen Idolatry*. Anſw. That the Reader may ſee what diſingenuity is here inſinuated, it is ſufficient only to advertiſe him that we do not accuſe the Church of *Rome* as guilty of Idolatry, for holding what ſhe delivers in the words now cited, but for holding what ſhe inſinuates in the words which follow, and which *T. G.* thought moſt convenient to conceal, *viz. That every perſon may pray unto them, and that not only with vocal, but with mental prayer*; and for enjoyning the ſick, *to pray with his heart when he cannot do it with his mouth, O all ye Saints intercede for me, and ſuccour me.* "What we *teach*, ſaith he, and *do* in this "matter, is to *deſire* the *Saints* in Heaven to *pray* "*for us*, as we deſire the *Prayers* of *one another* "upon *Earth*, and muſt we for this be compared "to *Heathens*? Do we not profeſs to all the World, "that we look upon the *Saints*, not as *Gods*, but "as the *friends* and *Servants* of *God*, that is, as *juſt* "*Men*, whoſe *prayers* therefore are *available* with "him? where then lies the *Heatheniſm*? where "lies the *Idolatry*? Anſw. it lies in praying to them with mental prayer, and in praying to them when they are as diſtant as is Earth from Heaven. But ſaith *T. G.* the *Queſtion* at pre- P. 353. "ſent between Dr. *Stillingfleet* and the Church of

"of

"of *Rome*, is not whether *Divine Worſhip* be p. 353.
"to be given to the *Saints*, but whether an *in-*
"*feriour worſhip* of the like kind, with that
"which is given to *holy Men* upon *Earth*, for
"their *holineſs*, and near *relation* to *God*, may
"not be lawfully given to them, now they are p. 389.
"in *Heaven*? And again, we *pray* no otherwiſe
"to them, than we do to *holy Men* upon Earth,
"though more *devoutly*, upon the account of
"their unchangeable eſtate of bliſs. Anſw. This
he doth frequently affirm, but till he can pro-
duce ſome inſtance of this practice of praying,
only with mental prayer to any Man alive, or
of petitions vocal directed unto living perſons
at ſo great a diſtance, his affirmation can be no
better than a manifeſt untruth; but this is a
peculiar Topick, of which, all thoſe who vain-
ly do endeavor to excuſe this Idol worſhip of the
Church of *Rome*, are forced to make uſe of,
viz. to affirm her Doctrine and practice, not
to be what certainly it is, and thence conclude
her not to be guilty of that crime, which could
not be denied without this Artifice.

Again, *the Queſtion between us, (ſaith the Dr.)* § 10.
is not how far ſuch wiſhes, rather then prayers, p. 173.
were thought allowable, being uttered occaſionally,
as St. *Auſtin doth this in* St. *Cyprian, but whe-*
ther ſolemn Invocation of Saints in the Duties of
Religious worſhip, as it is now practiſed in the Ro-
man Church, were ever practiſed in St. *Auſtins* p. 440.
time, Here *T. G.* repreſents him as a ve-
ry Shuffler, and moſt Rhetorically cries out,
"alaſs, that ſo many *Learned* Men ſhould all this
"while have been miſtaken in the Queſtion, that
"they ſhould have ſpent ſo much *oyl* and *ſweat*
"to no purpoſe! The Queſtion hitherto contro-
"verted between Catholicks and Proteſtants was

held to be, *whether it be lawful to invocate the Saints to pray for us?* and *whether this were agreeable to the practice of the primitive times?* But now like "a *miſchievous Card* that will ſpoil the *hand*, "this is *dropt* under the Table, and all the *ſhow* "aboveboard, is, whether it may be done in the "*Duties* (as he calls them) of *religious worſhip*? Thus *T. G.* as if all perſons that ever writ before them, muſt have ſpoken nothing to the purpoſe, if this had been the Queſtion between *T. G.* and him, or that this could not be the Queſtion, if what he mentions were another; or that it were impoſſible that Men diſputing whether this were agreeable to the practice of the Primitive times, ſhould alſo diſpute whether it were the practice of St. *Auſtins* time. Who knows not that one *medium* to prove this practice to be lawful, is, that it was the practice of the primitive times, and that St. *Auſtins* times are inſtanced in, as a ſufficient Confirmation of that grand aſſertion. This is the very method of *T. G.* and theſe are his formal words, *This was the Doctrine and practice of Chriſtian people in St.* Auſtins *time*; this he endeavors to confirm from that of *Cyprian*; and unto this the Dr. returns this Anſwer, and yet this muſt not be the Queſtion betwixt *T. G.* and him. Laſtly, the Dr. ſayth he undertakes to ſhew out of the *Primitive Fathers*, *that it was the property of the Chriſtian Religion, to give Divine Worſhip to none but God*, and in this ſtrain he runs on for no leſs then ten leaves together, and without ever proving that *Catholicks do give Divine Worſhip to holy Angels and Saints*, he moſt triumphantly concludes them to be *Idolaters*. Anſw. The falſhood of this paſſage is ſo exceedingly notorious, that there is nothing requiſite beſides the uſe of reaſon to diſcern it, for

p. 25.

§ 11.

p. 146, 159. we

159. We have this triumphant Argument. "Upon "the ſame account that the Heathen did give "Divine honor to their inferior Deityes, thoſe "of the Roman Church do ſo to Saints and "Angels. And how unhappy *T. G.* was in his attempts upon this Argument I have abundantly evinced: Again the Doctor Argues thus "The Fathers do expreſly deny that *Invocation* "or *Prayer* is to be made to Angels; for ſo *Origen*, and *Theodoret* ſpeak expreſly that *men* p. 158. *are not to pray to Angels*, and any one that reads "St. *Auſtin* will find that he makes ſolemn In- "vocation to be as proper to God as Sacrifice is. "2. On what account ſhould it be unlawful to "*Sacrifice* to *Saints* and *Angels*, if it be lawful "to *Invocate* them? May not one be *relative* and "*tranſient* as well as the other, can any man in "his ſenſes think that a meer outward *Sacrifice*, "is more acceptable to God than the *Devotion* "of *our heart* is? Thus the learned Doctor, and there needs nothing to convince us of the ſtrength and pertinency of this diſcourſe, but to reflect upon the vanity and weakneſs of what *T. G.* hath ventured to oppoſe againſt it. See. *Ch.*6. *Prop.*4. *Corol.* 3. beſides in vindication of the Teſtimonies of *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Theodoret*, St. *Auſtin*, *Hilary* the *Deacon*, and of the *Council* of *Laodicea*. I have clearly manifeſted that all theſe Fathers cited by the learned Doctor, do very evidently prove the Invocation of Bleſſed Saints and Angels to be, according to their judgements the giving of that honor to them, which is due to God, and ſo is properly divine.

I might be large upon the ſecond head *viz.* § 12. in giving many pregnant demonſtrations that he moſt wretchedly corrupts thoſe Fathers which he cites or Anſwers. But reader having glutted thee

thee with manifold examples of thiskind already, part 2. I beg thee to accept of these few instances which I shall represent unto thy view, noteing what he hath added to the words of those few Fathers which he hath ventured to produce or Answer, in a larger Character.

1. The words of Celsus are, Καὶ δὴ ἐπιγαλοῦντες αὐτοὺς ἰῶνται τῶν μερῶν τὰ παθήματα. Orig. advers. Cels. l. 8. p. 416. What T.G. cites is no where to be found.

2. Οὐδ' ἔξεστι τιμᾶσθαι οὐδενὶ ὅτῳ μὴ ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦτο δέδοται. Celsus apud Orig. l. 8. p. 384.

3. The words of Celsus are, Εἰ μὲν δὴ μηδένα ἄλλον ἐθεράπευον οὗτοι πλὴν ἕνα Θεὸν ἦν ἄν τις αὐτοῖς Ἴσως πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους ἀγενὴς λόγος νυνὶ δὲ τὴν ἔναγχος φανέντα τοῦτον ὑπερθρησκεύουσι καὶ ὅμως οὐδὲν πλημμελεῖν νομίζουσι περὶ τὴν Θεὸν, εἰ καὶ ὑπηρέτης αὐτοῦ θεραπεύθησεται. ibid. p. 385.

4. Ἦσαν τινες οἱ λέγοντες, οὐ δεῖ ἡμᾶς διὰ τῶν Χριστοῦ προσάγεσθαι ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν Ἀγγέλων· ἐκεῖνο γὰρ μεῖζόν ἐστιν ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς. Chrys. in locum.

5. Ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἀναξιόν ἐστι τῆς μεγαλειότητος τοῦ μονογενοῦς τὸ προσάγειν ἡμᾶς τῷ πατρὶ καὶ μεῖζον ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην σμικρότητα. Theophyl. in cap. 2. ad Coloss.

1. The invocation which *Celsus* contended for was *Votiva illis Sacrificia reddere. T.G. p.363.*

2. *Celsus* his evasion was that none are to be honored *for Gods* but those to whom the supreme God doth communicate it. *T. G. p.357.*

3. By *Celsus* this was not objected, but only that they were by the same rule by which they worshiped *Christ for God*, to worship in like manner the inferior Deities. *p. 358.*

4. *Chrysostom* saith that some among the *Collossians* said that *We ought to be reconciled* and have access to the Father not by Christ but by the Angels. *T.G. p.378.*

5. The reason why they did so is given by *Theophylact* because they esteemed it a thing unworthy of the Majesty of the Son of God *on the one side to make this reconciliation*, and far transcending mans poverty and lowness *on the other. T.G.* ibid.

This I confess is not so properly an addition (because he ownes it so to be) as a most palpable depravation of the Fathers sense.

These

Theſe are ſome few diſcoveries of the unchriſtian arts, and diſingenious deportment of *T. G.* towards the Dr. I wiſh I could ſay ſomething better of his learning or his judgement. But alaſs the whole Book clearly manifeſts that he is unacquainted with the thing called Learning. Let any man produce in his 440 pages one conſiderable notion which is not uſhered in with the great names of Dr. *Taylor* or of Mr. *Thorndyke*, let him point but to one ſingle inſtance wherein he ſhews himſelf a Scholar, or a man of reading, let him produce one obſervation or Authority which is not trivial and common in almoſt every Roman Pamphlet, and I will beg his pardon for paſſing ſo ſevere a cenſure on him. In ſhort, the only new thing in his book is this, that he adviſes Whores to have recourſe to *Mary Magdalene*. § 13. p. 369.

Laſtly, his want of judgement and dexterity in making inferences, cannot be doubted by any who conſiders what he hath diſcourſed, *p.* 222, 223. and *p.* 418. all which I have abundantly refuted with an *ha ha he*, and to conſider all the examples of like nature to them, would be to frame a ſecond Anſwer to his book. One farther inſtance of this kind we have *p.* 384. where he thus argues. "The *Council* of *Laodicea* both in "in the *Canon* 34 as alſo *Canon* 51. alloweth "the *honoring* and celebrating the *Feaſt-dayes* of "the *Martyrs* which is a *plain indication* that it "intended not to condemn in this *Canon* the "*worſhip* due to *Angels*. Which Syllogiſtically runs thus, they who allow the honoring and celebrating the feaſt dayes of the *Martyrs* cannot intend to forbid the invocation of Angels, but the *Canons* of *Laodicea* do allow the honoring and celebrating the feaſts of the Martyrs, *Ergo*

Note, that the word *Honoring* thongh it be printed in the Italick Character, is an addition of his own, the Canons cited by him only do enjoyn us. ἀγίων μαρτύρων μνείαν ποιεῖν.

Ergo. Anſw. And is it not notorious that the Proteſtants allow the honoring and celebrating the Feaſt-days of many Martyrs, why therefore doth he not conclude that they cannot condemn the invocation of the bleſſed Angels.

Again they who are *more to be honored than men* are to be invocated, according to *T. G.* but Angels in the Judgement of *Theodoret* are more to be honored then men, *Ergo. Anſw.* and is not this the judgement alſo of the Proteſtans, why therefore did he not infer that Proteſtants do not condemn this invocation.

And now conſider whether *T. G.* had reaſon to uſher in this inconſiderate and Childiſh tatle, with the enſuing Preface *it is manifeſt that the* Council *of* Laodicea *cannot with any ſhew of probability be underſtood of that worſhip which the Catholick Church gives to holy Angels.* And to conclude with ſuch a triumph, *by this the Reader may ſee whether we had more reaſon to fear the force of this Canon*, &c. Whereas that which is manifeſted and plainly indicated by this whole diſcourſe, is chiefly this, that *T. G.* labours not only under a great want of Learning but of judgement too. But to them who know that he is an Apoſtate from the Church of *England* all demonſtrations of this nature muſt be needleſs. What I have written I am humbly confident muſt be ſufficient to convince his conſcience of that horrid action if God peradventure will give him repentance to the acknowledgement of the truth which is the hearty deſire of him who honors his *Perſon*, and his *Wit*, whileſt he deteſts his want of Learning and of Judgement, and refutes his Calumnies.

FINIS.

The Contents are plac'd immediately before every Chap.r

Chapter	1st	ag.st worship of S.t Host	page 1
	2	— ib. —	— 13
	3	ag.st Transub. —	— 37
	4	— ib. —	64
	5	ag.st Worship of S.t Host.	101
	6	ag.st Creature Worship	129
	7	ag.st Invocation of S.ts	— 173
	8	Prayer dir.d to S.d Ins	205
	9	Testimonys of S.t Fell.rs consid.	243
	10	ag.st Invocat.n of Angels	301
	11	The Canon of Laodicea &c:	— 324
	12	Testimony of S.t Fathers	340
The Conclusion & its Contents			— 365

NB pp 382 . 383 Are excellently written. H

357239

UMI